

# THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

June, 1921

Vol. 9 No. 4

|                                                                                                                                                                                             |         |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|
| Editorial Comment                                                                                                                                                                           | - - - - | 291 |
| Do Protestants Want Unity?—Church Life in a Western City—A High Church Movement in Germany—Reforming the Church Kalendar—Mr. H. G. Wells and the Bible—The Blessed Virgin and Church Unity. |         |     |
| The Life of the Priest                                                                                                                                                                      | - - - - | 301 |
| <i>The Editor</i>                                                                                                                                                                           |         |     |
| Letters of a Modern Mystic, I                                                                                                                                                               | - - - - | 326 |
| Come Now Let Us Reason Together                                                                                                                                                             | - - - - | 331 |
| <i>Robert Leonard Tucker</i>                                                                                                                                                                |         |     |
| The Gift of Holy Fear                                                                                                                                                                       | - - - - | 346 |
| <i>Frank H. Hallock</i>                                                                                                                                                                     |         |     |
| The Practice of Fasting Communion                                                                                                                                                           | - - - - | 355 |
| <i>A Parish Priest</i>                                                                                                                                                                      |         |     |
| The Unspoken Revelation                                                                                                                                                                     | - - - - | 365 |
| <i>Caroline Frances Little</i>                                                                                                                                                              |         |     |
| Letters from a Layman, II                                                                                                                                                                   | - - - - | 370 |
| Book Reviews                                                                                                                                                                                | - - - - | 373 |
| Books Received                                                                                                                                                                              | - - - - | 383 |

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager  
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.



**Art  
of the  
13th Century**

**Ecclesiastical Statues of Devotion  
for Churches and Private  
Oratories**

**Polychromed and Gilded  
after the manner of  
the 13th century**

**ROBERT ROBBINS**

**49 Christopher St.**

**NEW YORK**

**THE  
NEW PARISH REGISTER**

*By The Rev. Charles Wells Hayes, D.D.*

In completeness of form and quality of work it remains unchanged from the First Edition, and is especially commended, as in all essential respects the BEST, and also the most economical to those Parish Priests who are careful to keep their Records full and accurate.

The prices which are given below are as low as any Parish Register of the same size and quality can be made.

**QUARTO SIZE 12¼x9½**

|        |                             |         |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------|
| No. 1. | 160 Pages, 300 Communicants | \$12.50 |
| No. 2. | 320 Pages, 700 " "          | 18.00   |

**FOLIO SIZE 14¼x9½**

|        |                             |       |
|--------|-----------------------------|-------|
| No. 3. | 160 Pages, 600 Communicants | 15.00 |
| No. 4. | 320 Pages, 750 " "          | 20.00 |
| No. 5. | 480 Pages, 1000 " "         | 25.00 |

They contain carefully proportioned pages for History, Families, Baptisms, Confirmations, Communicants, Marriages, Burials, Offerings. Index Space for Families is omitted in No. 5, to give larger space for other entries.

**EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher  
NEW YORK**



ESTABLISHED 1892

## **C. M. ALMY, Inc.** **Ecclesiastical Tailor**

**Clerical suits to order from \$45. Fitting and work-  
manship guaranteed. Faultless fitting Latin  
and Cassock Vests. Samples, meas-  
ure blank and fashion  
plate upon request**

**1-2-3 BIBLE HOUSE  
4th AVENUE AT 9th STREET  
NEW YORK**

**TEL. STUYVESANT 0847**

**OPPOSITE WANAMAKER**

## **CHRISTIAN WORSHIP**

### **Its Origin and Evolution**

**A STUDY OF THE LATIN LITURGY up to the Time of Charlemagne.**

By Mgr. L. DUCHESNE, Membre de L'Institut. Fifth edition. 593 pages.  
Price \$6.00.

**LITURGIES—Eastern and Western.**

Being the Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the  
Church by F. C. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., Pusey Librarian. 603 pages.  
Price \$8.40.

**MONUMENTA RITUALIA ECCLESIAE ANGELICANAE.**

The Occasional Offices of the Church of England according to the old  
use of alisbury the Prymer in English and other prayers and forms with  
dissertations and notes by WILLIAM MASKELL, M.A. Second edition.  
272 pages. Price \$20.00 for 3 Vols.

**HIERURGIA ANGLICANA.**

The Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers.  
Edited by VERNON STALEY. 3 Vols. Illustrated. 279 pages. Price  
\$7.50.

**PRIESTHOOD IN LITURGY AND LIFE.**

A Study in the Mystical values of the Christian Liturgy by A. H.  
BAVERSTOCK, M.A. 164 pages. Price \$1.25.

**EDWIN S. GORHAM**

-

**New York**

*Please mention THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY when answering Advertisements*

### CONTRIBUTORS FOR JUNE

*The Rev. Robert Leonard Tucker, Ph.D.*, is the minister of the Summerfield Methodist Episcopal Church, New Haven.

*The Rev. Frank Hallock, D.D.*, is professor of Old Testament Literature and Theology in Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn.

*Caroline Frances Little* is a Churchwoman living in Brooklyn.

# The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing  
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion  
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

*President:* GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

*Vice-President:* HON. WILLIAM J. TULLY, Corning, N. Y.

*Secretary:* THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

*Treasurer:* HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year

Canadian subscription, \$3.25 a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy

Foreign subscription, \$3.50 a Year

---

Volume IX

JUNE, 1921

Number 4

---

## Do Protestants Want Unity?

**P**ERHAPS the most weighty and significant utterance called out by the Lambeth Appeal thus far has been the report of a committee appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council. It is not a formal or authoritative reply to the Lambeth Appeal, as each Church will take its own course and make its own reply. It may be regarded nevertheless as an expression of the present state of mind of a representative body of Protestants on the subject of unity.



The document is long and we may make but the briefest summary of its main contentions. After describing the three stages in any effective movement towards unity,—the spread of a brotherly spirit, a real agreement on vital principles concerning the Church and the Gospel, and a scheme of practical proposals,—the following is laid down as the supreme principle: “The Church is the outcome of the Gospel—hence the importance which has always been attached by evangelical churches to ‘the preaching of the Word’—and the Church thus made by the Gospel must be free.”

They then proceed to examine three important elements in the Lambeth scheme: the recognition of Churches, episcopal ordination as proposed in the scheme, and the spiritual freedom of the Church. They wish to know definitely “whether Anglicanism is prepared to recognize non-episcopal communions as corporate parts of the Church of Christ, and their ministries as ministries of Christ’s Word and Sacraments.” They distinctly assert that they cannot regard any one form of polity as essential in the Church Catholic or in any true part of it, and they cannot therefore agree to submit—even conditionally—to episcopal ordination. By spiritual freedom, they mean that the united Church cannot impose creeds as a test of membership, and cannot be in submission to the state.

In conclusion they suggest as a scheme of practical proposals that the Churches be led into unity of service, and ultimately into corporate unity through interchange of pulpits and inter-communion. “We ask our Anglican brethren, on their part, to welcome and to promote closer spiritual fellowship among the churches, especially through the pulpit, at the Communion Table, and in the work of the Kingdom.”

We welcome this frank statement of principles on behalf of the so-called Free Churches of Great Britain. In our opinion it simplifies immensely the whole problem of reunion. If no one form of polity is essential, if the priesthood is unnecessary, if episcopal ordination is superfluous, if every body of Christians is already a corporate part of the visible Church of Christ, if no creed is necessary as a test of membership in the Church, if the preaching of the Word is the fundamental Christian task and the Church is the outcome of the Gospel, then why not continue to go on as we are? We already have unity if only we be large-minded enough to exchange pulpits and invite everybody to communicate everywhere — and the Church of England will allow itself to be disestablished and disendowed. Why worry about unity? You can have it if you think you have it. Like some new Alice in Wonderland, you can eat your cake and have it too!

---

### Church Life in a Western City

**WE** have often thought it would be interesting to take a few months off and travel about the country visiting other churches. This is an idle dream however, for we must stay in one place to make our living. The best we can hope for is to see churches in other cities and villages through the eyes of keen observers among our friends.

One of these friends has just reported to us ecclesiastical conditions in a western city:

The Roman Catholics have a Cathedral and a large congregation near where I live. They had a set of priests that looked pretty decent to me as I viewed them in the chancel,—Irish brogue, however, good and strong.



Grace Episcopal Church has no week-day communion services, but has one at 7.30 every Sunday. At 10.30 there is choral Morning Prayer. They glory in Morning Prayer. Dr. N., the rector, is about sixty years old, and preaches flowery and oratorical sermons full of metaphors, similes, and so forth. This morning he addressed the congregation on the Easter offering and said he did not like to appeal to people of their brilliant intellect and exquisite sensibilities for cold cash! I looked around at the physically comfortable and financially complacent congregation and inwardly chuckled. It sounded like "soft soap" to me, especially as he later told the people that they were an almost perfect congregation, but he wished some of them would come out to an evening service occasionally. The choir is mixed—male and female—with excellent, well-trained voices. Morning Prayer seems to be a pleasant and sociable affair. Many come late,—several trailing down the aisle during the prayers just in time for the sermon.

There will be a communion service at 7.30 on Easter day, and a glorious Morning Prayer at 10.30! I thought there would be a late mass on Palm Sunday, but I got left!

I was motoring the other day and saw what looked like a little mission chapel. I find no notices of it in the newspapers, but a colleague thinks it is a little group of "very High Church Episcopalians." I intend to investigate it.

Is it correct to have acolytes in full white vestments with heavy cord girdles at Morning Prayer? Four went ahead of Dr. N. in the procession with much solemnity. . . . There is no confessional at Grace Episcopal, of course. Saturday afternoon before Easter they have a baptismal service for children.

I went to S. Mark's mission chapel. The interior is good—plain buff walls, a simple white altar with tabernacle and a hanging red lamp in the sanctuary. There are stations of the cross—sand-stone—uncolored. There were about sixty people in the congregation this morning. The choir is small and needs practice. The rector is a middle aged man, with simple, sincere manner and intelligent in his sermon-talk. They lack vestments and altar hangings. The flowers were few on the altar. A number of the congregation were elderly people. However, I've settled the question and this chapel is where I go.



There is a little Methodist chapel on the corner of our street. The young preacher is a student in the State University. Tonight the old lady with whom I live—a strong Methodist—invited the preacher to supper. He thinks it strange that anyone of my New England ancestry should turn Episcopal—and High Church at that! He deplores the fact that I go way down town to church instead of coming to his church. He thinks it would be inspirational for me to come to a prayer meeting and tell them about how Aunt Miriam looked and her home life, and what kind of a desk she sat at when she wrote those wonderful old hymns! He says Dr. N. of Grace Episcopal is a "regular fellow," broad and interested in everybody, and goes to all the college baseball games. The preacher also says he didn't have time to do evangelist work in Lent, so he's going to have four revival meetings this week, and Dr. N. is to conduct the one for Thursday evening.

---

### A High Church Movement in Germany

**T**HERE is an interesting movement in Germany which is being carried on by the society known as the High Church Union. This Society, according to its published reports, "aims at the improvement of the Churches of the Reformation in respect to their constitution and worship" and defines the Church as "the visible organ of salvation founded by Christ and the Apostles." It seems to correspond to the Free Catholic Movement among non-conformists in England.

In the monthly organ of the above mentioned society there is a summary of an address given on "The Essence of the Church" by Pfarrer Stoevensanot, of Trinity Church, Berlin. In this address he maintains that the Reformation conception of the Church unduly exalts the personal aspect of the Biblical conception of the Church, and so weakens the power of the ecclesiastical organism to maintain itself

in conflict with secular education, and effectually to represent holiness in divine worship, as also to direct the souls of individuals, and to inspire the Christian spirit into the mass of the people. The High Church Movement seeks to avoid the faults of the Roman and Reforming Separatist Churches, and thus to strengthen the consciousness of the independence of the Church as a Divine institution; and to render the catholicity of the Church fruitful, by making the best possible use of the treasures of ecclesiastical tradition, by invigorating the tone of the Church, and by transforming the manifestations of the moral life according to the spirit of the Church.

This movement, like the Free Catholic movement in England and elsewhere, indicates that there are many serious-minded Protestants who are seeking to undo some of the lamentable mistakes made by their forefathers at the time of the Reformation.

---

### Reforming the Church Kalendar

**I**T is an amazing world. The British parliament has before it a bill to make Easter a fixed date! One wonders what business parliament has with a Church festival until one remembers that Easter is probably thought of as a secular holiday rather than as the great commemoration of the Resurrection. Indeed, we had a glimpse of an item somewhere which suggested that it marks the opening of the season for trout, a circumstance which at once explains the movement to any fisherman. But why leave all to the British parliament? Why do not the friends of the measure seek to have it brought before the League of Nations? Or do they fear that the United States Senate would make



a "reservation" on this point—possibly apply the "Monroe doctrine," or avoid an entangling alliance? Of course a plank could be inserted in the platform of one of the great political parties in the next general election, and the presidential candidates might be urged to pledge themselves. What a splendid "reform" issue! While the matter is being adjusted it might be well to put the Ascension on a Sunday, and to consider whether December is altogether desirable for the Nativity—or rather Boxing-Day. There are other matters: saints-days are painfully irregular; a proper regard for the decimal system would remedy the seven-day interval between Sundays and incidentally eliminate some of these inconveniences to business; eleven o'clock might be fixed by statute as the hour for matins instead of its being in constant danger of being "sequestered" by some presumptuous priest, as one good bishop complained. The crowning advantage of all would of course be that we would be less "like the Catholics."

---

### Mr. H. G. Wells and the Bible

**M**R. H. G. Wells is always interesting and stimulating. Sometime since he discovered or at least proposed a new God. He was very much dissatisfied with what he—quite wrongly—supposed to be the God in Whom Christians believe and Whom they worship, and so he offered for our acceptance a Deity who he felt more truly met our needs. Since then he has written a history of the world or rather of the universe, and later, in a few brief newspaper articles, has made known to us what he conceives to be the truth about Russia. Now, he wants a new Bible, up-to-date and adapted to modern problems. The old book

"held together the fabric of Western civilization," it "has explained the world to the mass of our people" and it has "given them moral standards and a form into which their consciences could work." But it is "no longer a cement" and we need a Bible to restore "a common ground of ideas and interpretations" and to hold together our "increasingly unstable civilization." He suggests that it be drawn up by a committee, and instances as proofs of the practicability of this process *Magna Charta*, the King James Version, and the Book of Common Prayer! He outlines its plan. It is to begin with a universal history, strikingly similar in conception to that which has recently flowed so readily from his own pen. It is to put the world "on a new footing with regard to social and international affairs." It is to deal with sanitation, diet and sex, with property, trade, and labor—in short with those questions of the day which so fill the vision of the average reformer and economist. The questions of eternity, the vision of the supersensual and immaterial, the ideals and motives which lift men above the brutes, the struggle against sin and the longing for holiness, the laws of the spiritual life, our relation to our communion with God, appear to have no place, or at least are not mentioned as having place, in the new Bible! Truly a new Hamlet with the part of the Danish prince omitted! How could anyone so intelligent as Mr. Wells have read the Scriptures and have been so blind to their meaning, have missed so entirely the secret of their message for mankind?

There is another fallacy underlying Mr. Wells' absurd suggestion of a new Bible. He makes the Old Testament first, the New Testament later, the controlling, regulating, inspiring, disciplining, informing power which has created



civilization. Of course he altogether mistakes the history and office of Old Testament and New Testament. They were the products, not the sources, of the mighty life which filled them. Books—whether histories, hymns, laws, letters, or lives—reflect, illustrate, and embody the civic and religious forces of which they are the expression. True, they may make more permanent what might otherwise disappear, and they even have a certain secondary power of their own. But they do not create, they only transmit. They may be the fruits, but they are not the root. Nay, they wither and die apart from the society and institutions from whose soil they have sprung. They may abide as literature, glorious memorials of a splendid past. They furnish models for imitation and enthrall for a moment the imagination, but they only move men so far as they may convey the impulse which brought them into being. This holds regarding the Bible as well as concerning lesser books. It was the Church, whose vigorous, divinely planted, life was expressed and reflected in the writings of her apostles and evangelists, that constituted the real moulding and determining power in forming Christian civilization. As surely as any people frames its laws, builds its houses, and extends its roads, so she wrote her books, developed her worship, and ordered her discipline. Let Mr. Wells read a little more history, and he may yet come to recognize that it was the tremendous driving, energizing, preserving power of the Church which built up a new world on the ruins of the old, and at the same time converted, purified, and sanctified individual souls. If the old Bible has lost its power it is for those who forcibly tore it from the Church whose book it is. It is dead only apart from the living Body to which it belongs. To it and in it, it lives and speaks. No,

a new Bible will not "recement" civilization. Nothing can avail save the warm, living, sustaining force of the great Society, the very Body of the everliving Lord, through which He ever acts to teach and guide and heal.

---

### The Blessed Virgin and Church Unity

FATHER Hughson writes as follows regarding his article which appeared in our April issue: "A distinguished critic has written me that he thinks my quotation from Bishop Hall of Norwich implies the latter's belief in invocation of saints. As I was careful to describe him as militantly 'anti-Roman' and as writing 'with a protestant spirit that is unknown amongst us today,' I cannot think how anyone can conclude from my words that he held such a belief. But however that may be, lest any should be misled, please let me say that the old Bishop of Norwich was totally opposed to any such invocation of saints as that which I was advocating in my article. He would certainly never have used the Hail Mary."



## The Life of the Priest

REV. SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D.

1. The Town Parson, by Rev. Peter Green, M.A. Longmans, 1919.
2. Priesthood in Liturgy and Life, by Rev. A. H. Baverstock, M.A. The Faith Press, London, 1917.
3. The Catholic Faith in Practice, by Rev. Francis Underhill. Cope and Fenwick, London, 1919.
4. Pastoral Work and Life Today, by Rt. Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield. Longmans, 1919.
5. Pastoral Theology and the Modern World, by Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A. Oxford University Press, 1920.
6. The Art of Public Worship, by Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D. Morehouse Publishing Co., 1919.
7. The Conduct of Public Worship, by Rev. F. H. J. Newton, B.A. Longmans, 1919.
8. The Priestly Vocation, by Rt. Rev. Bernard Ward, Bishop of Brentwood (Roman Catholic). Longmans, 1918 (Westminster Library).
9. Preaching, by Rev. W. B. O'Dowd. Longmans, 1919 (Westminster Library).
10. Le Prêtre, par L'Abbe J. Berthier, M.S. 2 volumes, Institut de la Sainte Famille, Grave, Holland, 1913.
11. Directoire de Vie Sacerdotale, par Monseigneur Gouraud, Evêque de Vannes, Paris. Gabriel Beauchesne, 1920.

It is frequently said that the power and prestige of the Christian ministry have of late years enormously declined, and that the ministry now attracts to itself fewer men of conspicuous ability than it did a generation ago. These charges are undoubtedly in many respects true. A sufficient evidence of their truth is to be discerned in the steadily decreasing number of candidates for the ministry. In 1916 our five Eastern Seminaries had 256 students; to-day they have 179. In 1916 there were 466 candidates and 692 postulants. In 1919 there were 306 candidates and 393 postulants.

There is nothing surprising in these facts. In a materialistic civilization like the one in which we are living the influence of religion necessarily diminishes as the power of materialism develops towards its climax. It does not require any great prophetic insight to perceive that in the nineteenth century and the earlier years of the twentieth the world has increasingly turned away from things spiritual to things material. This tendency has been manifest in every department of life. In education the old ideals of a liberal training in the knowledge of the humanities have been slowly but surely forced out of our schools and colleges by the newer conception of education as a practical preparation for every day living. In architecture we have forgotten how to build structures that are beautiful, in a mad passion for the building of such utilitarian structures as office-buildings, factories and cold-storage warehouses. We attempt cathedrals, but we rarely complete them. In literature we no longer write poetry and prose that will endure through the ages. Instead we write best-sellers, scientific treatises, encyclopedias and hand-books on business efficiency. In art we strive chiefly for tech-



nical accuracy so that our paintings resemble photographic reproductions of things as they are; they are almost totally lacking in the sacramental expression of a spiritual meaning in the mind of the artist.

That men have in this way turned from the spiritual to the material, from the eternal to the temporal, is not the fault of things spiritual and eternal; it is not the fault of God; it is not even the fault of the Church. It is the fault of men.

It is entirely natural that in such a world the young men of conspicuous ability should be drawn into material pursuits: engineering, manufacturing, mining, high finance, and so forth. The young man just emerging from college feels the lure of the prizes for which most other young men of his acquaintance are striving. He has no inclination to join the few poets who are starving in garrets, the artists who are painting futurist pictures, the journalists who are lost in anonymity, the statesmen who are only politicians, the teachers who can barely eke out a living on their meagre salaries, or the clergy who are tolerated but ignored by a pleasure-loving, mammon-worshipping world. Besides, he wants a motor car, an expensive wife, a summer home in the country, good clothes, and clubs. Accordingly he follows the crowd along the broad and easy way that leads to material success.

Nevertheless there are many men in this evil and adulterous generation who have heard the divine call to serve in the ministry of Christ. They have overcome many obstacles, at home and among their friends, and have responded to the call. After years of conscientious service they can honestly say that they have found the ministry worth while. As a profession it has given them all the

power and opportunity that they can use. Indeed they have been conscious of being able to compass but few of the rich opportunities that have been presented to them. The prestige of the ministry may not be what it once was; but prestige after all may be an illusion, the work of a prestidigitator; it can never be an ideal of the follower of the Crucified. They cannot see why the ministry should be any the less attractive today than it ever was,—except financially, and that does not greatly trouble them. Most of them would not hesitate to say to those young men who think they have heard God's call to this kind of life, that the ministry is immensely attractive as a profession and it does bring genuine joy to all who are sincerely in earnest in their work, because in manifold ways it employs all their energies for the glory of God and the redemption of men.

Let us then consider some of the functions of the Christian priesthood, and see whether they are sufficiently vital and necessary to attract virile, red-blooded, broad-shouldered men. There is of course a widespread notion that a clergyman has nothing to do but prepare one or two sermons a week and conduct religious services on Sunday. There are undoubtedly some clergy who do little more than this; but then there are discreditable members of every profession and occupation. Ideally, however, the Christian ministry demands all of a man's time and energy for at least five distinct kinds of work: prayer, study, preaching, pastoral work, and leadership.

#### I.

#### *Prayer*

The work of prayer is the first and most necessary work of a priest, because that is the work that is directed toward



God; and it is from God that all grace must come, both for himself and for others, if his ministry is to be effective. If God is what the Christian religion proclaims Him to be, then it would be folly for His ministers to assign to prayer anything less than the first place in their lives. Just as the nursing mother must take abundant nourishment, so the clergy must always take time to pray. The official services of the Church, the daily mass and offices, together with their private prayers and meditation, should comprise the most essential part of the day's work. These would ordinarily require from two to three hours a day spent in prayer. I do not need to argue here for the daily celebration of the Eucharist. I am assuming that every priest who loves our Lord will want to come into His presence at the beginning of every day, and plead the Holy Sacrifice on behalf of his people and the work that he is trying to do among them. It is easily possible for any priest to arrange a daily mass if he wants to. He can always find a half-dozen faithful boys, each of whom could serve one day every week; and that would give him his congregation.

It is in prayer that we gain true wisdom, the knowledge possessed by the saints, and the love of our Saviour. A word from the mouth of a priest who truly loves God will produce more fruit than a thousand wise and beautiful discourses from those who love Him not. The Apostles wisely gave over to the deacons the serving of tables,—including most of what we should call today the work of social service,—in order that they might give themselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the Word.

Mental prayer or meditation is especially necessary in the daily life of the priest. Fenelon once said that “not impiety nor the spirit of independence, nor vice, but lack

of reflection" was the cause of most of the evils that come upon society. If the intelligence is not thoroughly penetrated by the truth, the will cannot be impelled, nor the heart guided, on the way to Heaven. It is fatal to allow ourselves to be led by the imagination, which is always prone to evil. Moreover the truths of the Faith are to those who do not meditate upon them like gold unmined, a sword undrawn, or a letter unopened. It has been the testimony of all those who have given it a long and serious trial that meditation is one of the most efficacious means of avoiding sin, of becoming acquainted with one's faults, and of gaining the power to practice virtue. An eminent saint once said that other exercises of devotion may co-exist with sin, but not mental prayer; either we abandon mental prayer, or we abandon sin.

Prayerfulness is the road to godliness. A man of God must be a man of prayer. Godliness, or piety, is the primary requisite in the life of the Christian minister or priest. Mere knowledge can never take the place of piety. Some one has said, "Knowledge without piety is like a sword in the hands of a child; it can only do harm without doing good to anyone." It has also been said that "the world is converted by saints, and not by wise men." St. Ignatius Loyola, speaking very imperfectly in the Italian tongue, preached at Rome with such fervor and simplicity that his hearers hastened to confess themselves in tears. On the other hand certain orators of profound knowledge and brilliant speech have never effected a conversion. Souls are converted and sanctified only by pious and prayerful priests. Piety cannot be sustained except by the faithful keeping of a rule of daily prayer and meditation. No lamp



can burn without oil and no priest can live a pious and godly life without regular and systematic prayer.

## II

*Study*

Study is also a prime necessity in the equipment of the minister of God. Only men who can take time to read and think are fit to be the spiritual leaders and teachers of the people. "The priest's lips should keep knowledge." St. John Chrysostom said, "A priest may, by his example, maintain the good in the way of holiness; but he cannot lead the ignorant to the way of knowledge." St. Leo the Great said, "Ignorance is hardly tolerable in a layman, it deserves neither excuse nor pardon in a priest." Many a sad experience on the part of faithful souls has demonstrated the lamentable consequences of ignorance in a confessor or preacher. St. Alphonsus Liguori goes so far as to say that the priest is in a state of damnation who without sufficient knowledge exposes himself to hear confessions.

In the designs of God the ministers of the Church are to be depositories of His truth, the interpreters of His laws, and the dispensers of His grace. They can fulfil none of these functions without knowledge. The clergy who are ignorant know neither the natural and philosophical truths, which require deep study for their mastery; nor the Christian truths, for their theology has been either poorly acquired or entirely forgotten. They do not know their Bibles, therefore they can interpret neither the ancient law nor the new law of Christ. They cannot dispense God's grace if they know neither the diseases of men's souls, nor the proper remedies to be administered for their cure.

As a minimum of intellectual attainment the ministers of the Church should know the science of priestcraft. In other words, they should be so thoroughly equipped in the science of morals that they can hear confessions and give the necessary moral or spiritual advice; they ought to be able to teach the faithful the things which a Christian ought to know and believe for his soul's health; and they should be well-versed in the laws and canonical requirements of the Church. In addition to this minimum requirement it is desirable that the clergy should have an intimate knowledge of the Bible, the history of the Church, liturgics, to say nothing of the principles of logic, philosophy, social psychology, economics, and sociology. They should also have at least a speaking acquaintance with the classics and the masterpieces of modern literature as well as being familiar with the main tendencies of contemporary thought. Profane sciences may sometimes have a real utility, but ordinarily it would be absurd for a priest to give the main part of his time to their study. One would hardly select a doctor because he was well-versed in literature. Neither would one seek out a confessor because he was a brilliant botanist or astronomer.

What a life the priest leads who does not study! Either he passes his time entirely in the works of the ministry, in which case he is always with others and never alone; or he lives in idleness. In the former case one must pity the souls of those who are nourished by one who never takes nourishment himself. What anaemia threatens them! In the latter case what will the poor priest do to while away his time? One meets him everywhere, a scandal to all who see him. Or he bores himself in solitude with nothing to do. Even



when he seeks consolations in the outside world, they are onerous and gloomy to him, for he can never forget that he was not made a priest in order that he might lead an idle self-indulgent life. What perils meet him on the way! It is almost impossible for such a priest to keep within the bounds of decency.

Study, on the other hand, saves him from useless visits and idle meanderings. It removes him from the corrupting society of the world. It prevents him from wasting his time and debasing his manhood in frivolous amusements. It conserves the sacerdotal spirit of recollectedness and retreat. It furnishes the mind, nourishes the heart, renders easier concentration in prayer, and enables him to exercise all the functions of his ministry with fruitfulness. Study gives to a man the highest consolations of earth, next to the consolations of piety. The happiness is not of the senses, but of the intellect and heart. A studious priest never finds time hanging heavily on his hands. The day is always too short for him. He knows not the meaning of loneliness. In fact his main difficulty in life is that he can never find time enough for the study he has laid out for himself. He has so much knowledge to acquire, and the duties of the ministry leave him so little time.

It was wise advice, with a strangely modern sound, which St. Paul gave to Timothy. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Meditate on these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine, continue in them, for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and those that hear thee."

## III

*Preaching*

It is a tremendous responsibility to stand before a congregation Sunday after Sunday for the purpose of preaching a sermon. No other public speaker is listened to with such quiet reverence and such rapt attention. Whether we think of the sermon as the central feature of Christian worship, as Protestants do, or merely as an interlude in the act of worship, as Catholics do, we must admit that the sermon is immensely important in either case. Here are numbers of faithful gathered together in the presence of God, engaged in one of the most solemn acts, who are looking up to the preacher for inspiration, for comfort, for instruction, and for the solution of life's difficulties. Has he a message adequate to meet their needs? Does he know how to deliver it effectively? Is his life such as to give insistence and reality and force to his message? It must be confessed that many preachers, if they spoke the truth, would be compelled to answer all of these questions in the negative. St. Alphonsus Liguori once said: "If all the preachers and all the confessors would fulfil their obligations as they ought, all the world would be sanctified. Bad preachers and bad confessors ruin the world; and by bad I mean those who do not properly perform their duties."

The Blessed John of Avila, when consulted as to the best means of preaching with fruitfulness, replied, "I know of no better means than to love our Saviour much." That is undoubtedly the primary requisite. To set on fire the hearts of others one must be a burning coal. The tongue speaks only to the ears of the hearers; it is the heart that speaks to their hearts. *Cor ad cor loquitur*. Christian



piety ought to shine forth through the daily living of the priest; and therefore his daily life ought never to contradict his teaching nor have anything of a secular or worldly character about it. That is one reason why it is well always to dress as priests. We need to remind ourselves constantly that we are the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Pere Le Jeune, in teaching young men how to preach, said, "My first advice is to pray fervently to God." St. Francis of Assisi ordinarily prepared his sermons on his knees before a crucifix. Once when he was to preach before the Pope, he prepared himself by long study, and he failed utterly. The next time he was called upon to appear before the Pope he reverted to his usual method and made a deep impression. On commenting on his experience he said characteristically: "It was Francis who spoke the first time; it was our Saviour who spoke the second time."

Eloquence has been defined as the art of pleasing, instructing, and moving one's hearers by the spoken word. Let us consider these three elements in turn.

Ought a preacher to seek to please his congregation? Surely not in the sense of satisfying "itching ears." He may however seek to please in the sense of giving pleasure by teaching his people in the way that leads to heaven and eternal life. To this end he should study all the legitimate arts of sacred oratory.

If we are really to edify and instruct our people we should preach a doctrine which is within the reach of all; we should preach saving truths that are strong and powerful, capable of inspiring a horror of vice, the love of virtue, the fear of hell, the desire of heaven, and a sincere love of God and our Saviour. It would seem clear that the creed

and the decalogue, the precepts of the Church and the sacraments, the virtues and the vices, the proper duties belonging to different classes of persons, the last things, and other similar eternal truths, ought to form the ordinary matter of sacred preaching. These very grave subjects are shamefully neglected today by many of our preachers, "who seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." They know well that it is not such subjects which will gain them the popularity they desire; therefore they leave them on one side, or refer to them only in Lent or other solemn occasions. They substitute for them other subjects which will tend to seduce the spirit or the imagination instead of acting on the will and reforming the morals of their people. Religious errors among people of the Church generally have their root in the passions of the heart rather than in errors of the mind. "The fool has said in his heart"—not in his mind—"there is no God."

Not only must the preacher give much attention to instruction in the fundamental truths of the Catholic faith, but he should also seek to move the hearts of his hearers. His primary concern should be to make them good rather than wise. It is incumbent upon us to warm and stir the emotions of our people so that they will determine to renounce sinful habits, and attach themselves to God. The conclusion of each point of our sermons and the peroration should be practical, animated, lively and pressing. To this end our language must be simple. A saintly preacher has said, "If the poorest people do not comprehend me, what good is it to call them to church? I will have to render an account of everything else,—why not of my sermons? It is well to have in mind the profit some humble workingman or woman



is to derive from one's preaching. It may be the one sermon in the year for them; why not try to save them?" We should beware particularly of sonorous and high-sounding words about progress, the welfare of the nation, the conclusions of modern science, and so forth, thereby neglecting the saving truths of religion.

Even when by the gentleness, the charm, or the variety of our preaching we succeed in interesting, instructing, or moving the hearts of our people, we should see to it that we come down from the pulpit in time. St. Francis de Sales, who was not only a most effective preacher, but a man of sound commonsense, said: "Believe me it is by long experience that I am led to say this: the more you say the less they will retain, and the less you say the more they will profit. You extinguish the lamps when you put in too much oil. Mediocre preachers are acceptable provided they are brief; and excellent preachers are not acceptable when they are too long. No quality in a preacher is more odious than tediousness."

After preaching it is well to apply oneself incontinently to humble oneself before God for the faults one has committed. Afterwards the preacher should read a book or employ himself in some way to avoid the satisfaction which may fill his soul when he imagines he has done well, or the inward sadness when he fears he has not been successful. It is better still to pray to God insistently that by His grace the seeds of salvation one has sown in the souls of the hearers may take root and bring forth fruit abundantly.

#### IV.

##### *Pastoral Work*

One of the most important qualities in a priest is zeal

for the salvation of souls. It is undeniable that the priesthood was established primarily for this purpose. All the other sacraments have for their end the salvation of those who receive them. The sacrament of Holy Orders presupposes sanctity in him who receives it; but its principal end is to render the subject apt and fit to occupy himself with the salvation of others.

We are co-workers with God, and the work of God with which we are primarily concerned is the salvation of souls. Someone has said, "It is a greater work to make a saint out of a sinner than to create heaven and earth." God has not called us to aid Him in His work of creation but He has called us to aid Him in His work of redemption. He has willed that priests should be the saviours of men. Our Lord said to His Apostles, "I will make you to become fishers of men." He expects to find in His priests not merely the ardor of the fisherman but also his patience. Indeed we should aim to be like hunters, to pursue sinners with the same avidity that they display in pursuing game. God has called us to be laborers in His vineyard, and therefore He expects us to bring forth fruit. Our Lord made this extraordinary declaration to the first ministers of the Church, "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you." The Father sent His Son that the world might be saved through Him, and at what a price! He sent Him also to be the Physician of souls. For these same purposes we have been called to the sacred order of priesthood. We are often called by the name of "Father." It is well that we should be so called for it reminds us of our high calling to be the father of all our people. St. Vincent de Paul exhorted the women who were tempted to renounce the foundlings they had adopted

with these words, "Their salvation is in your hands. If you attend to them they will live, if you cease to be their mothers they will die." How much more is this true in regard to the priests and the souls that have been committed to their care.

The characteristic virtue of the priesthood should be a burning zeal to promote the glory of God and the salvation of our fellow-men. We boast of being in the line of apostolic succession. Are we indeed worthy to be the successors of the apostles if we are not heirs of their apostolic spirit? Can our heroism in the labors of our ministry be compared to theirs?

St. Alphonsus Liguori once said: "It will not do to say, I am a simple priest, I have no charge of souls. I ought only to be occupied with myself. No, every priest is obliged to apply himself with all his power to the salvation of souls. Idleness in priests is a terrible crime." The priest who, able to work for the salvation of souls, does not do it, is like the man who buried his talent in the earth; and he cannot escape condemnation when he stands before God.

St. John Chrysostom went so far as to say: "I do not speak rashly when I say that I do not think many priests will be saved. Many more will perish,—not from scandalous practices, but from lack of zeal. That is sufficient to damn a priest." The shepherd is not innocent because he does no harm. The pastor is obliged to banish and drive away from his flock all erroneous doctrine, to extirpate disorders, such as the desertion of the sacraments or the profanation of Sunday, to seek those who go astray, to instruct the ignorant. "Woe to the shepherds who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks?"



We need have no fear, if we apply ourselves diligently to our task, that our ministry will be without fruit. God has promised, "My word shall not return unto me void." When we speak God's word to men it is always accompanied by a gift of grace, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. This is proven abundantly by history. The apostles' preaching had marvelous effects, through obstacles were not lacking. So it has been with apostolic men through all ages. What marvels of grace have they not performed! What miracles may be accomplished today in an indifferent parish by a holy priest! We recall the miracle of the reviving of the dead man's body that was placed by chance near the body of Elisha. So it is with an indifferent people who are brought in contact with a holy priest, who is sent by God, and is indeed dead to self, to the world and all its hopes.

Why should not all of us be priests and pastors of apostolic zeal? We have the same means at our disposal that they had: prayer, the sacraments, meditation, God's Word. Moreover we have more books to study, more good examples to follow. What is the difficulty, why should we differ from them? Is not the trouble in many cases that we are not simple-hearted enough, that we are not wholly concentrated on the one aim of being good priests? We are thinking too much of our own ambitious designs, or we are too eager for pleasure, or we have allowed ourselves to sink into idleness and self-indulgence.

Think of the favors of God which are bestowed upon the zealous priest both in this world and in the next. During this life we are assured of His love. "I love those who love me." We remember our Lord's words to St. Peter, "lovest thou me? Feed my sheep." What joy we are able

to give to the Good Shepherd when we go after the lost sheep! St. Teresa envied the evangelist more than the martyrs, for as she said, those who labor for the salvation of sinners procure so much glory for God. A good pastor must make every sacrifice. A pastor who wishes to procure for himself all sorts of comforts and takes all kinds of precautions for the preservation of his bodily health can never properly fulfil his ministry. It has been a rule with many apostolic men of zeal that a priest should not take to his bed until after three attacks of fever. Think what glory the priest gives God by the children whom he keeps pure through the frequenting of the sacraments, the young people whom he directs to the priesthood and the religious life and the practice of virginity, and the souls whom he leads to the ways of eternal life.

God's favors continue even in the moment of death. Death is full of sweetness for the priest who has used his life for God. The souls a priest has sent to heaven will intercede for him at the hour of his death. St. Ignatius said that if he had his choice between going to heaven at once or remaining on earth to labor for the salvation of souls he would choose the latter. "Is God a tyrant? In seeing me risk my salvation to win souls for Him, would He wish to send me to hell?"

God's favors continue in the life hereafter in the glory of Heaven. If he who gives a cup of cold water shall not lose his reward, what of those who feed the starving with the divine Word. It frequently causes much effort and difficulty to exercise zeal; but we have the divine promise that "they that go forth with weeping sowing good seed, shall doubtless come again with joy bringing their sheaves with them." Our efforts may now appear to be sterile.

Never mind, we shall be rewarded in God's good time according to our labor, not according to our successes.

Courage, confidence, hard work,—those are the qualities that are required in a priest. God's glory and the salvation of souls should be our only aim. We should not allow ourselves to think of the personal qualities of people with whom we are working, nor of their interest as sociological cases. As immortal souls all men are interesting. Let our zeal be broad and generous so that it may embrace all sinners; the children as well as the parents; and the parents as well as the children. It is a pitiful spectacle to see a priest spending his whole time over a few devout souls. We must try to be assiduous in the confessional, in visiting the sick, in correcting sinners,—ignoring their rebuffs,—in preaching well-prepared sermons, in prayerful conversation with all whom we meet, in good example, in prayer. Old age is no excuse for negligence in a priest, much less middle age, with its temptations to sloth and lukewarmness.

The chief requisite for effective pastoral work is that the priest himself be living in daily vital union with his Saviour. Only thus can his soul be assuredly and constantly the vehicle of the Holy Spirit; and if the Holy Spirit is not abiding in the priest there is no especial point in his coming in contact with men and women either for pastoral work or for any other kind of work. Of course his sacramental ministrations do not depend upon his moral or spiritual condition; but his pastoral ministrations do. Only in so far as he is in mystical union with Christ can his contact with the souls of men be helpful and fruitful.



Broadly speaking there are two ways of fulfilling our pastoral duties towards the people who are committed to our charge: either we must go after them or they must come to us.

The priest is under obligations to visit the sick and the dying as well as to seek out all those who are growing careless and those who are living in mortal sin. Like our Lord we have come to seek and to save that which is lost. It is not necessary that we should make pastoral calls on all of the members of our congregation, but it is necessary that we should call on those who are in special need of our help. If the priest is to make any systematic visitation of his parish, especially if the parish be a very large one, it would be well to devote his attention especially to becoming thoroughly acquainted with the men. This need not be only by looking them up in their homes; one may invite them to luncheon or go to see them in their places of business. If the men of the parish are thoroughly canvassed and made to feel that the priest has a real interest in their spiritual welfare, there will not be any difficulty in getting the women interested too. Theoretically the man is the head of the family, and presumably the wife and daughters will be interested in the Church if he is coming to the services regularly and faithfully. There are of course certain unattached females that must be dealt with separately, particularly old ladies. The priest should not neglect the old ladies of his parish. They more than anyone else would appreciate a call from him. To be sure they are not always interesting; but they have souls and their spiritual needs are real. The priest should certainly be on his guard in his pastoral relationships with all

women under fifty and with young girls. He must especially avoid any unusual degree of intimacy with them. The more impersonal and detached he is in his dealing with them, the better it will be for him and for them.

The other way in which we may fulfil our pastoral duties is by making it possible for people to come to see us. This should almost invariably be in the church. Whether they come for confession or merely to ask for counsel or advice, it is far better to receive them in the place where the atmosphere is especially conducive to conversation on spiritual matters. Some men, of course, must be received in one's study where they can be given an opportunity to smoke, as there are apparently many men who cannot talk freely or without embarrassment unless they are under the spell of nicotine. It will be found however that even hard-headed business men often welcome the opportunity to confer with a priest on strictly spiritual matters in the midst of sacred surroundings. A priest should therefore have special hours at which he is to be unfailingly found in his church. If it were known to his people that he would be in his church on every Saturday from 4 to 6 in the afternoon and 7.30 to 9 in the evening, many people would get into the habit of coming there to see him about their spiritual difficulties or to confess their sins. We should make it as easy as possible for people to find us for these purposes and not require them to make special appointments. The troubled sinner may easily come and unburden his soul when he knows that a priest is in the church at a specified time, whereas if he were compelled to ask for an appointment he would put off making his confession for many months.

In addition to these two ways of coming in personal contact with our people there is a third way which should not be neglected, namely the gathering together of a few devout or especially interested people for classes of instruction, Bible classes, or meditation. This is particularly true of candidates for confirmation. There is no more important time in people's lives, spiritually speaking, than the time when they are preparing for confirmation. The priest has here a rare opportunity to lay foundations and build up human souls in the fear and nurture of the Lord. Classes of instruction, important as they are, are not enough. The priest should aim to secure a number of personal conferences with the individuals in the class so that he may instruct them in the things which they especially need to know. If one has to fill a great many bottles with water, it can be done more effectively by taking each one individually and pouring the water in, than by throwing a stream of water on all of them collectively.

## V

*Leadership.*

We hear a good deal in these times about the eight hour day. I wonder how many of the clergy are working on the basis of an eight hour day. We certainly ought to give at least two hours a day to prayer; two hours to study; two hours to the preparation of sermons, instructions, and other kinds of writing, and two hours to pastoral work. An eight hour day of this kind, together with many other duties that must be attended to, will not leave much time for any kind of leadership. Undoubtedly the things which we have been thus far talking about must come first in the priest's life. Unless he is a man of



prayer and an earnest student and a vigorous preacher and a zealous pastor, his leadership is not likely to be in demand in any field of human activity. On the other hand if he is faithful in fulfilling these essential functions of the ministry he will be in constant demand as a guide and counsellor, not to say leader, in all sorts of ecclesiastical, social, political and civic activities. Moreover unless he is very watchful, burdens will be imposed upon him which ought rightly to be assumed by the laity. There is no reason, for example, why a priest should serve on a draft board, or buy the coal for a town in war time; or be a general man-of-all-work in times of peace.

There are however, real demands of leadership which he must consider. He must somehow find time for the wider interests beyond the narrow confines of parochialism. The Church is the light of the world. It must therefore illuminate and guide and strengthen all such movements of the time as are the result of Christian teaching and a gradual formation of society by Christian principles. The Church ought to help people give expression in social and civic life to their Christian aspirations, and also supply the moral and spiritual dynamic which will enable them to carry such work through to a successful end. This of course is not peculiarly the work of the clergy. The whole body of the Church must do its part; but people are quite right in expecting the officers of the Church to lead the way. There have been times in the past when the Church has lamentably failed to let her light shine before men. It is said, for example, that after the war of 1870 the Church in France was unable to do anything more than to offer certain new devotions to the faithful. A God-given oppor-

tunity had come to the Church to inspire and strengthen a sorely stricken nation, and the Church knew not the day of its visitation. The same thing has happened in many countries today after the world-wide cataclysm from which we have not yet entirely emerged.

There are certain ecclesiastical movements which ought to enlist our interest and may rightly claim our leadership. There is first of all of course the movement to convert the heathen nations of the world to the Christian faith; there is also the movement to build up a system of Christian education in a land where children are being brought up in the public schools without any knowledge of religion; and finally there is the movement towards Christian unity in all its various phases, which cannot but appeal to those who have the mind of Christ.

There are also other movements of a less ecclesiastical character which are yet distinctly in accord with the religion of the Incarnation. There is for example the movement towards international brotherhood which is expressing itself at present in the efforts to form a really effective association of nations. It is difficult to understand how any Christian can hold aloof from such a movement, much less oppose it, when he realizes that it is only through the establishment of some such international agreement that disastrous wars can be avoided in the future. Then in our own nation there is the movement, which has already enlisted the sympathy of many men of good-will, towards a better social order, to be based on justice and fellowship among men. This would involve the recommendation of some such principles as these:

A maximum legal working day of eight hours with strict regulation of over time and night work.

Effective measures to insure reasonable security of livelihood by guarding against and mitigating the effects of unemployment.

Reasonable holidays with pay for wage earners.

A comprehensive scheme of housing reform, in the carrying out of which women should have an effective voice.

The amelioration of the conditions of rural life.

The bad industrial conditions which have had so cramping and chilling an effect, not only on educational progress but also on the development of the spiritual life, ought to be corrected as soon as possible.

No priest can remain insensible to conditions of social injustice and oppression which condemn many of our fellow human beings to a subsistence less than human. Especially today, when we are threatened by a world-wide Bolshevik revolution, the priests of the Church ought to do all in their power to bring about a social order based on Christian principles and thereby make such a revolution unnecessary and impossible.

There have been in England notable leaders among the clergy who have never tired of preaching on the social implications of the Gospel. Such prophets as Maurice, Kingsley, Westcott, Scott-Holland, Dr. Charles Gore, and Dr. William Temple, have done much to awaken the English people to a realization of their social sins and to bring about a better order of things. We have had too few men of this stamp among our clergy in America.

It is well to bear in mind that no one priest can do everything. It would be better for each one of us to take



some one field and inform himself so that he may become an expert leader in that particular field. Therefore in addition to our obligations as parish priests we should each one of us be doing something either in the way of intelligent leadership, or obedient cooperation with those who are wiser than we, in the mission work of the Church, or in the field of Christian education, or in movements towards Christian unity, or in the promotion of international brotherhood, or the establishment of a better social and industrial order at home.

In entering upon any work of leadership we must be constantly on our guard lest we become so absorbed in the affairs of the world that the keenness of our spiritual enthusiasm becomes dulled and we fail to fulfil our vocation as priests. It will perhaps help us to view things in their right proportions if we keep in mind the distinction between the Church as the body of Christ, and the member of the Church as citizens of the state. The Church as a body has nothing whatever to do with the state. She belongs to another order of things entirely, an order that is spiritual and other-worldly and eternal. The members of the Church, however, in their capacity as citizens of the state, must of course, according to their opportunity, strive for the adoption of Christian ideals in government, in legislation, in commerce, in industrial affairs, and in social life. We must however never allow ourselves to forget that our true home is not here. We must not set our hearts on this fleeting and transitory world. We are merely pilgrims and strangers on the earth, and as we go on our way towards the heavenly country we must act in every relationship of life on Christian and other-worldly

principles. When we cast our vote, when we serve in the army, when we conduct business operations, when we mingle among men and women in their pleasures and recreations, we must be different from people of the world. They are governed by principles of expediency and advantage and material prosperity. We should be men whose gaze is fixed on the land of far distances, whose hearts are in Heaven, and who are laying up treasure in a Kingdom that is not of this world.

---

## Letters of a Modern Mystic

### I.

**M**Y dear L—,  
This letter is by way of keeping my promise to write you now and then something of my experience of the Prayer-life. Perhaps before proceeding to describe the experience which has brought so much to me, and which I hope by God's grace may bring some good gifts to others, it would be well to summarize briefly the meaning of the experience and the nature of the goal to which it has led, as helping to make plain the point, and heighten the significance of the details of the experience as they are told.

Let me say at the outset that this summary follows the lines laid down by all the great mediæval mystics and saints in their characterizations of the supreme Christian experience. One might easily think, perhaps, that I was plagiarizing. I do not question that the writings of those old mystics have helped me to formulate my experience in words. But the point is that the experience is one. Al-

most without exception I have had individual experience of some fact or phase of mysticism before I had any understanding of what the mystics were saying about that particular fact or phase. There is a school of modern thinkers who would insist that my reading of the mystics induced the repetition of their experience in me. That is not the case. Doubtless there is guidance and help from reading the mystics. But the experience follows out an organic law of its own—as every one who passes through it positively knows. It can by no means be induced nor manufactured; it is a living thing, maturing to its own inevitable consummation. Whence the great wonder and joy of discovering the one supreme experience in all the great men and women of Christ.

There are three stages in the Prayer-life. Each stage has its own effect upon that which is basic in our nature, where all our problems center; the effect of prayer at each stage being vastly greater, speedier, more thorough than in the stage preceding.

The basic in our nature which prayer affects is the will—or, in terms of the old New England theology, “the affections.” For our will is but the going-forth, the utterance, of our desires. Our loves, affections, desires, are that towards which our will goes forth: and the fundamental work needed in our nature is that complete renovating and elevating and universalizing of our affections whereby our wills shall move wholly and only in deep response and utter harmony with the will of God. This is called “sanctification,” and is the solution of human problems; so that Jesus said, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart—and soul—and mind—and



strength: this is the first and great commandment." That our love and desire should be wholly and with all our being set on what God is and what God wills is the ultimate human need, the solution of human problems. Sanctification is the experience also that opens the windows of the soul for the shining in of truth; so that from this experience for the first time we fully know and understand. As Jesus said again, "He that willeth to do His will shall know of the teachings."

This profound work in the will that is sanctification, with its fruit in the knowledge of the truth and the solution of our problems—with, also, its strange gift of power—is wrought by prayer. And in prayer, as I have said, there are three stages. To be sure, most people experience the prayer-life not at all, do not enter upon even the first of these stages. Of those who truly pray, with whom prayer is a habit, far the greater part never pass out of the first stage.

It is the stage of feeling, in which emotion constitutes the predominant prayer-element. The "sense of God's presence," the experience of "blessing," the inward warmth and glow considered to be God's gracious evidencing of His favor, yes, often taken to be His assurance that He hears and will answer, this inward delight and gratification, the soul's immediate "joy in the Lord," is, in this primary beginner's stage, counted the chief element in prayer. I want to finish consideration of this stage right here, before mentioning the other stages, as there is little to be said about it save that one should leave it behind forthwith.

Nothing is more changeable, evanescent, dependent upon adventitious circumstances, than our feelings. Then

how insecure and superficial must be the religious life that discovers God and the evidence of His presence and favor chiefly in them! In fact, of course, the relation of our infinite Father and of His presence and love to our lives is absolutely independent of our feelings; though, *per contra*, our feelings will be found to depend absolutely upon the depth of our knowledge of God, of His reality, presence, and love. Moreover, as the great saints take greatest pains to emphasize, to love God and pray to Him for the sake of delightful inward feelings is no more truly loving God than if we "loved" Him and "prayed" to Him for the pleasure we received from worldly prosperity or power or fame.

Of course these inward feelings do help the beginner in prayer to make a beginning, they afford the immediate encouragement which enables him to try again; but to make them the end and aim and justification of prayer, as so many do, is to blight and pervert prayer at the start, and turn it aside from any worthy development and fruition; though it has, of course, some fruit in that these "spiritual" desires can and do in a measure supplant more grossly selfish and earthly desires, and, in that little degree, do train the will to responsiveness and harmony towards God.

The second stage of prayer may perhaps best be termed that of "Meditation." It consists in voluntarily focussing the attention upon the thought of God in any one of the infinitely varied aspects of that thought as given substance and shape by the Incarnation in Jesus Christ, and drilling the mind in such concentrated attention until it becomes possible to organize the entire field of consciousness about God as its center. This stage of the prayer-life pro-

ceeds wholly independently of the feelings, conditioned only by our powers of rational thought and volitional attention. The effect of this practice upon the will and desires is immediately marked; it shortly produces results which, in the earlier prayer stage, one may have striven for, for years in vain, particularly after one comes to the point where consciousness "crystallizes" now and again about the thought of God. My next letter will tell in detail just what this special state of consciousness is.

The practice of meditation persisted in, made a habit, becomes that without which one cannot live, and so carried on further and further, leads at last—probably after years—to the third stage, which the old mystics called "Contemplation." To people of today, "contemplation" means practically the same thing as "meditation." But the two stages of the prayer-life that the terms indicate are absolutely different. The third stage leaves thought behind, just as the second stage leaves feeling behind; for it is an immediate perception of God by the soul that carries one beyond the point that thought can reach. And while the experiences that come in "meditation" wait upon voluntary attention, the experience that forms the heart and core of "contemplation" is purely a gift utterly beyond human willing as it is beyond human thought.

Led through dark waters and great agony of inward dying, one awakens on a day to the perception of infinite Love—an absolute knowledge, a given fact, the present and eternal Reality: and from the knowledge of that Reality whose name and nature are Love, mind and soul, consciousness and will, are parted nevermore. Then begins a new life, a new world; because then one is taken possession



of by Love, and loves Love with all the heart and soul and mind and strength. Through this new oneness with universal Love one is made "free indeed," life's problems are solved, a new power works in one's life, a new harmony is revealed day by day, Love abides with one as the supreme and infinite actuality. Into that knowledge of Love one withdraws at any moment, under whatever stress, amidst whatever confusion, and is at peace, is then at one with God.

I am sorry to have written at such length without coming down to practical details that may bring you present help; but perhaps I may have said a little to make the long, hard, blessed way of the prayer-life seem worth while. It is supremely worth while. I want you to know it—to prove it in experience.

Faithfully yours,

H.

---

## Come Now Let Us Reason Together

REV. ROBERT LEONARD TUCKER, Ph.D.

**O**F historic importance is the statement on Christian Unity recently made by the assemblage called together by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth and the discussion provoked among Nonconformists on the one hand, and Churchmen on the other, gives fulsome testimony to the seriousness with which the proposal is being received. Probably no body of Christians without the Established Church gives closer scrutiny to the terms and ideals underlying this proposal than the various bodies of Methodists, as is evidenced by such thoughtful communications

as that made by Bishop Luther B. Wilson of the Methodist Episcopal Church in a late issue of *The Churchman*. Since this frank and friendly state of mind prevails, it would seem that an investigation of those historical causes which brought about an ultimate separation between the Church of England and the Methodists might be pertinent, and that following such an endeavor, the question might be suggested: Do the original causes for this separation still prevail and are there any fundamental reasons why these two bodies should remain apart? Such is the purpose of this paper.

One cannot consider the movements within the Church of England in the eighteenth century or deal with the separatist movement that reached its high-water mark in this epoch without taking into account Mr. John Wesley—scholar, organizer and churchman. In reviewing the activity and faith of this man which relates to the widening of the gulf betwixt the Methodists and the Established Church, one must avoid committing the fallacy of concluding that if the causes of original dividing within the Church be known, remedies for overcoming this disunity can necessarily be prescribed with any certainty. The causes of ancient divisions are frequently no longer those same causes which at present work such havoc in the universal Church. It must be confessed, however, that an understanding of the beginnings of any historical process can aid one in seeing more clearly the direction of its development and its present significance. A resumé of the past ought, therefore, to give us a better knowledge of the present status of the Established Church and of Methodism together with their relationship—if there be any—toward each other.

Mr. Wesley was a unique combination of a mystic, a practical man of affairs, and an idealist. As an idealist he looked upon the religious decadence of his day with an emotion akin to that of violent disapproval. "What is the present characteristic of the English nation?" he asked. "It is ungodliness. Ungodliness is our universal, our constant, our peculiar characteristic." He felt that "heathen morality" was the characteristic trait of his day and hesitated not at all to chastise both the Church and the clergy for the low standards which prevailed. Undoubtedly all was not well with the Church when those loving her most dearly agreed as early as 1713 with Bishop Burnet who boldly declared: "I see imminent ruin hanging over the Church, and by consequence over the whole Reformation. The outward state of things is black enough, God knows; but that which heightens my fears rises chiefly from the inward state into which we are unhappily fallen." And still one feels that the ideals of Mr. Wesley parted company with sound judgment when he described the clergy as, "dull, heavy, blockish ministers; men of no life, no spirit, no readiness of thought; who are consequently the jest of every pert fool, every lively, airy coxcomb they meet." Though the moral and religious standards of the Establishment were not as high as might have been desired; nevertheless the presence of such personalities as the venerable Bishop Porteus and the solemn Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, demonstrated that affairs had not sunk to such a depth as Mr. Wesley's comments would imply.

Between high ideals and the practical world of affairs is



a gulf, making an accurate judgment of world conditions impossible—and by the light of these ideals the affairs of the world generally appear blacker than is the case. Holding such a view of the life about him, Mr. Wesley could not but emphasize certain truths that would seem to him fundamental. Hence Methodist doctrine of this era was colored by the conditions prevailing on every side.

Of Methodism's early period it would not be unfair to say: that whatever Mr. Wesley believed and taught, eventually became incorporated among the doctrines of that part of the Church Universal. Among the doctrines receiving unique emphasis at his hands was that of Original Sin. Mr. Wesley was very consistent and thoroughgoing in his statement of this doctrine. With Adam came the sin which had continued to grow from his fall to the present time, and included Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, and almost every other cult. None were untouched. Mr. Wesley could conceive of no exceptions to his statement: "We bear the image of the devil and tread in his steps." Dogmatic as this *credo* may appear to our modern age, it is significant to note that none of the steady-going churchmen differed to any striking degree from Mr. Wesley regarding this teaching. Only a few touched by the currents of rationalism then flowing through England, such as the eminent John Taylor, author of a scholarly work, *The Doctrine of Original Sin*, ventured to dispute these conclusions. This doctrine, ever distinctive of Western theology, and first proclaimed by Augustine in this theory of *universal corruption*, was a legacy common alike to both Methodist and Churchmen and therefore could be no bone of contention between them.

With this point of view that conceived of most of the known world as on the road to hell, it was to be expected that Mr. Wesley would place great stress upon the doctrine of the New Birth. According to him, this teaching was a necessary corollary to the Protestant doctrine of Justification. The forgiveness which one felt was expressed by justification, whereas the new birth was more thorough and expressed that process of character transformation which actually took place in life. It conceived of God as a strict judge. The once born man was damned while the benefits of salvation came only to him who had experienced the mystery of being *born again*—"a change wrought in the souls by the Almighty Spirit of God."

Interesting and important it is to note that many of the Establishment also agreed most harmoniously with Mr. Wesley in these statements; while no less a person than Francis W. Newman, a contemporary whose orthodoxy was never questioned by the Church, said, "God has two families of children on this earth; the *once born* and the *twice born*." It was only when the Methodists went so far as to assert they could mark the precise time and hour of this experience and transformation; and only when they seemed to place their hopes of heaven in emotions and feelings, that a moderate and qualified objection was made, of which that advanced by Bishop Gibson of London was an instance. With characteristic gentleness he reminded them that the Established Church in its baptismal service used the phrase, "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness;" and expressed his wishes that the Methodists would continue to proclaim the doctrine of the new birth—but with a little more intellectual insight. He who

will carefully investigate the evidence must discover no fundamental differences on this point between the followers of Mr. Wesley and the Church. Such lesser differences as were manifested came from two distinct types of mind looking at an identical fact from different horizons. Criticisms offered to Mr. Wesley by Churchmen against extreme interpretations of the new birth are the same criticisms offered today by a host who still count themselves within the Methodist fold. Today both Churchmen and Methodist raise one and the same objection.

Since in neither of the two above-mentioned doctrines appears conspicuous differences between Mr. Wesley and the Establishment, it is reasonable to suppose he held some objectionable theory of the Church. The Church is defined by him as "A congregation of people united together in the service of God." In support of this he claimed Paul as his authority. Now let it be remembered that this definition was formulated at least a generation before the Oxford Movement and the Tractarian Controversy gained any notable headway, and was so broad that few could find fault. Although he stated he would include people within the Church of England who might hold wrong opinions—and this is plainly a violation of the Nineteenth Article—yet in the major tenets of the doctrine, so small and inconsiderable were the differences of opinion between Mr. Wesley and the Church of England, that one recalls no prominent controversy centering about the doctrine of the Church as it was advanced in the theory.

An examination of many more doctrines treated by Mr. Wesley reveals the same general result as with the three just surveyed. A detailed investigation of such others as



Justification, Christian Perfection, the Witness of the Spirit, and Assurance, will afford a very parsimonious proof of any outstanding opposites in belief twixt Wesley and the Church.\*

As the Methodist Movement developed and its adherents adopted a standard of *Twenty-five Articles*, it is obviously apparent that in this action they felt themselves to be erecting no theological fences setting them off from the Church; for with the exceptions of articles such as those dealing with the practice of holding slaves or the matter of loyalty to the president of the United States, these articles are taken *in toto* from the classic *Thirty-nine Articles*. It is also well to recollect that the British Wesleyan Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church are both alike in that they have clothed the sermons of Mr. Wesley with the dignity of doctrine. The sentiments advocated by these preachments they profess to accept. Since the dogma of these sermons is that of Mr. Wesley and hence must approximate that of the Establishment; and since these Churches accept this dogma, here must be further evidence that the theology of the Wesleyan Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church on the one hand, and the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church on the other must be substantially the same.

The inevitable habits of normal progress have characterized all these religious bodies during the past century and a half and yet no radical doctrinal innovations have been made. Having made due allowance for this natural growth, it may be stated that between the Wesleyans and the Church or between the Methodists and the Episco-

---

\*Separation of the Methodists from the Church of England. R. L. Tucker, p. 39 ff.

pallians there never was, never has been and is not at present any radical difference in opinion or belief concerning the dominant fundamental teachings of Christianity. Both groups are trinitarian, both accept the two sacraments of Protestantism and both practice the two-fold ordination. Not unmindful of the Anglican Movement within the Establishment and the growth of the Congregationalist spirit among the Methodists, it still seems reasonable to assert that the preponderating number of both these groups hold substantially the same theological views; and that opposing doctrinal standards cannot be blamed, since they are no cause, for the spiritual scandal openly committed on the part of these churches by disobeying the plain commands of Our Lord who bad us all "be one."

Why are these two great sections of the Church apart? If there be no doctrinal cleavage, what then is the wedge between them? To revert again to a study of Mr. Wesley, the fact is revealed that his emotions of violent disapproval of the age in which he lived did not stop with his stressing of certain points of theology; but went further and expressed themselves in certain definite lines of action. He felt morally compelled to *act*—to do something to change the social customs and religious practices of his times.

As is most usually the case, it was a complete misunderstanding of the facts which brought about the first activity conclusively resulting in an estrangement between Mr. Wesley's followers and the Church. With much unction Mr. Wesley had been proclaiming "inward present salvation, as attainable by faith alone." A misconstruction was put upon this message which caused many

churchmen to conclude that he thought neither of the sacraments necessary for salvation. One who would preach such a type of salvation as excluded the two sacraments was unwelcome in the pulpits of the Establishment. Still greater must be the regret that Mr. Wesley was a *persona non grata* to the Church when it is recalled that at Epworth and elsewhere he repeatedly urged the people to attend the Church services and the sacraments. But the blunder was made, and to save a world so "utterly lost" Mr. Wesley and his followers took to field and street preaching. This action served to antagonize the clergy even more and they retaliated by resorting to both peaceful and violent methods to break this innovation of custom.\*\*

Without prejudging the case, one can well understand the attitude of the clergy if a comparison with the Salvation Army of our own day be made. Regardless of the excellent work the Army has accomplished, the criticism of it by the Church especially in its earlier days has been very severe. It broke custom and conventionality and therefore appeared to cheapen and vitiate religion—such has been the criticism from many quarters of the Church. Similar opinions and fears prevailed when Mr. Wesley began to use what today would be called "Salvation Army Methods;" and though he sincerely declared he was within his rights as a member of the Established Church when this step was taken, yet field preaching broke the religious conventions of the day and a noticeable breach between his followers and the Church was the unfortunate result.

The success of this field preaching from Mr. Wesley's

---

\*\*Josiah Barr. Early Methodists Under Persecution. Canon Overton ad lib.



point of view was unquestionable and the final upshot was a developed system of preaching from place to place somewhat resembling that of the itinerant Friars in the days of Edward VI. What later came to be known as the *itineracy* was established whereby Mr. Wesley and his friends travelled according to a precise plan, delivering their message throughout England and in parts of Scotland and Ireland. Arguments and objections very similar to those brought against the Franciscans and Dominicans of an earlier epoch were advanced against this procedure for it too was no respecter of parochial boundaries. But the system brought results and was retained to the transforming of the lives of individuals and—to the widening of the breach.

But the world was still “absolutely under the bondage of sin” and since any feeling of fellowship with the Establishment was conspicuously absent, Mr. Wesley continued on his course. He must at all odds save the world. Practical needs of the day again resulted in his taking another step and he introduced lay preachers into his plan. Enough trained and ordained preachers for his type of work could not be found. He turned to the ranks of carpenters, teachers, farmers, physicians, day-laborers and the like for recruiting these preachers. Although he supervised them like an autocrat, they were a source of keen offence to the clergy. The clergy misunderstood and misjudged them. Lay-preachers often being uneducated possessed not always the largest amount of tact; but they made up for it with a diligence for the welfare of the masses of England that must ever command the respect of all men. But since the social spirit had not entered

Christianity with the impetus of today, and since in its place ecclesiastical formality and correctness of procedure held sway, it is easy to see how these lay-preachers drove the wedge deeper.

From the use of lay-preachers it was but a step to the practice of ordination. This act did away with all possibility of harmony between Mr. Wesley and the Church of England. Even Archbishop Secker in a statement remarkable for its calmness and sound judgment, said, "we may apprehend—whether rightly or wrongly is not to be disputed now, but sincerely—that the episcopacy is of apostolical institution. . . ." The theory of apostolic succession held sway within the Church at this epoch. Few churchmen disputed it. Mr. Wesley, however, a man of strong will and not inclined, after an experience of consistent opposition, to be overcareful of any opinions finding their source in the Church, turned neither to the right nor to the left. Amid a storm of protest in 1784 he ordained Whatcoat, Vasey and Dr. Coke not only to preach but to administer the sacraments.

When Mr. Wesley ordained these three gentlemen it is very clear that he had not the slightest thought of promoting the idea of an episcopacy. Wesley was no lover of bishops. Their shortcomings were too vividly in evidence in his day. When therefore, Dr. Coke ordained Francis Asbury, the famous circuit rider, the wrath of Mr. Wesley knew no bounds and he wrote to Coke concerning the deed as follows: "One instance of this your greatness has given me great concern. How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called a bishop? . . . Men may call me a knave or a fool; a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content;

but they shall never, by my consent, call me a bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, put a full end to this. . . . I study to be little; you study to be great. I creep; you strut along." To establish more bishoprics in the world was the farthest from his design. Religious developments in America got beyond his control and hence the departures of American Methodism. It must also be candidly stated that Mr. Wesley did not ordain to further antagonize the Church, or to fulfil any exact theory which he held; but rather to meet a practical need. He conceived of men and women as being "lost" daily in England and Ireland and was willing to resort to almost any means to save them. In so doing the breach which already was wide became a chasm and that calamity—the separation of the Methodist from the Church of England soon became an attested fact, as the *Plan of Pacification* and the *Regulations of Leeds* executed after his death clearly showed.

The science of sociology teaches that mental and practical differences such as peculiarities or standards of conduct are socializing forces. One can see there was practically no difference twixt Mr. Wesley and the Church as to the *content* of the various doctrines; and but little opposing opinion regarding the *emphasis* which should be placed upon such doctrines as have been heretofore enumerated. On the other hand there was marked and vigorous opposition to such practices as ordination, the itineracy, the use of lay-preachers and field preaching. Continued facing of opposition had its effect upon the followers of Mr. Wesley in that it served as a means to reconstruct and dominate their social grouping. The consciousness became fixed with the Methodist that they were unlike the mem-



bers of the Establishment and at the same time they became aware of their likeness to one another. Although Mr. Wesley professed repeatedly, "I live and die a member of the Church of England," and issued a tract entitled *Reasons Against Separation from the Church of England*; yet this consciousness of difference could not be overcome, with the result that within the ranks of his followers it has served to separate them from the Established Church even until now.

But the religious "geography" among the Methodists and the Churchmen is not what it was in the days of Mr. Wesley. There are now no doctrinal differences of consequence and these bodies have little difference in their chief practices. Both the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America have utilized lay talent to a marked degree during the past generation. In 1886 the Archdioceses of Canterbury and York set up the Houses of Laymen, and later the Protestant Episcopal Church admitted laymen on equal rights with the clergy to their highest legislative body. This is a change from the antipathy expressed toward laymen who at an earlier epoch sought to fill positions of prominent usefulness in the Church. A movement of this nature cannot go hand in hand with any increase of antagonism toward lay preaching. And the tremendous emphasis that has been placed upon the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* and the many kindred societies, together with the magnificent and humble work of American and British Episcopalianism in the mission fields the world over, would indicate that the nausea against modern and sane field preaching was rapidly ceasing as a cause of separation.

Then, too, the attitude of the episcopacy is much changed. Such characters as John Green, Bishop of Lincoln, Bishop Butler, of Bristol, and the scholarly writer of the *Analogy*, together with the notorious Lavington, made the possibility of any harmony between the Church and Mr. Wesley null and void. Today the episcopacy is much more friendly; *i.e.*, if the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury in appointing his special committee, the friendliness of the Bishop of Durham and the words of Bishop Gore in any wise be an augury of a general attitude of mind and heart. With a friendly episcopacy in England, and an episcopalianism in India and China that is thoroughly convinced of the supreme folly of division; to which may be added the Protestant Episcopal Church in America which already has made overtures to its Congregationalist friends—with friendliness and openminded sympathy on the increase—it would seem that the possibilities of success in submitting a formal proposal for bringing the branches of a world-wide Episcopalianism and Methodism together on a platform of mutual understanding ought to be within reason and hope.

Still the delicate matter of *ordination* and the *episcopacy* remains to be settled, and the writer is not unmindful of the Anglican High Church party holding fast to the belief in apostolic succession and the indelibility of orders on the one extreme; while on the other extreme is the ultra liberal Methodist who looks upon a Bishop as nothing other than a general superintendent or frequently is a person who desires the abolition of the episcopal office altogether. But the fact cannot be denied that the conditions which made it appear impossible for the Metho-

dists to remain within the Church no longer prevail, and the habits, spirit or customs of the Methodists which made them repulsive to good churchmen are no longer offensive. Either they have disappeared or they have been adopted by the Church. Historical bases for separation are gone—never to return. Even the barrier of the episcopacy has received a weakening blow at the hands of the noted Dr. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, who in his recent Bampton lectures sets aside as uncatholic the claim to exclusive validity of orders claimed by the Church and claims the support of Augustine for his conclusions. Dr. Headlam will have a happy influence among his friends concerning this moot problem, which will do the cause of unity no harm.

Since the grounds for staying apart are removed, why not get together? For the sake of the Kingdom's future, and for mutual self-respect, it behooves the extreme wings of these two great bodies to modify their views in favor of some kind of unity. A middle course must be found. With the foundations that have for a century and a half been supporting a pagan individualism rapidly crumbling away, these churches are left stranded in an impossible position. Before God and man they have no adequate apology to offer for their separateness. And the judgment of a world, which is becoming increasingly tolerant in its method of thought, will be severe on those Christian bodies, which, when they find themselves with no historical or utilitarian reasons for remaining apart, refuse to engage seriously in that high undertaking—the business of settling their differences, and in a practical way, for practical purposes come to some manner of understanding and



unity for the more effective co-operation toward bringing in the kingdom of their common Lord.

But eventually the spirit of Mr. Wesley, which made him declare "the world is my parish," will prevail among his followers in the Church of England and in Methodism. For the salvation of every last child of God in this world-wide parish they will forget their differences and remember only their likenesses. They will more truly have a common Christ who alone is the hope of a war-torn humanity which even now tries to rebuild according to the plans of the city of God. And because of the attempt for some kind of a unity which they shall make there will be given a mighty impetus to this rebuilding.

---

## The Gift of Holy Fear

REV. FRANK H. HALLOCK

**I**T is somewhat surprising to find fear listed among the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. We think of fear as something to be struggled with and overcome, as the hero of H. G. Wells' "The Research Magnificent" struggled and overcame. We might suppose that one of the purposes of the Gifts was to save us from fear and to insure tranquility of spirit. But this Gift is Holy Fear; it may help us to understand what it is if we first have clearly in mind what it is not. It is not the fear of terror, not that of Adam hiding himself in the Garden from God's Presence and saying, when discovered and questioned as to his motive, "I was afraid." Nor is it the fear of what the world may think or say about us, the fear of Peter in the high priest's

palace, for this fear is of little value in a Christian sense even if it leads us to do what is right; and it may keep us from God if it makes us ashamed to do what our conscience bids us do because we shrink from the possible ridicule of associates who will regard us as "righteous overmuch." Nor is it the fear which keeps us from secret wrong-doing because we are afraid of the punishment which awaits us in hell.

Holy Fear is none of these things. It is "loving anxiety to please God"<sup>1</sup>. It "wraps us in a protective vestment as of fire against sin, and it lifts us up into the eternal verities of the heavenly worship"<sup>2</sup>. "It means that sense of awe or reverence when we are in God's Presence, or when we are thinking of Him, which is the very foundation of all sanctity"<sup>3</sup>. It is this Gift of the Holy Spirit which makes us realize "with special intensity that the supreme loss to the soul would be the deprivation of God"<sup>4</sup>. It is the fear which springs from and increases with real knowledge of God and of ourselves. It increases as the effects of the operation of the other Gifts appear increasingly in our lives.

The presence of Holy Fear is not due to sin alone, it belongs to the eternal mysteries in the relation of the Creator to the creature; thus the angels who have not known sin veil their faces with one pair of their wings, not that they may hide themselves from God's sight, not because

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. F. J. Hall, *Theological Outlines*, vol. 3, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup>Bp. Grafton, *A Catholic Atlas*, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup>Dr. A. G. Mortimer, *Catholic Faith and Practice*, vol. 1, p. 151.

<sup>4</sup>Rev. G. F. Holden, *The Holy Ghost the Comforter*, p. 149. This thought goes back to St. Augustine. Dionysius the Carthusian says: "Timor est habitus voluntatis per quem efficitur homo optime mobilis a supernaturali inspiratione Paracleti ad vitandum omne malignum secundum directionem seu opem Spiritus Sancti supernaturaliter in homine operantis."

sin has made it impossible for them to look upon Him, but because of His awful, unapproachable Holiness. The view which makes fear part of an elementary knowledge of God to be superceded as knowledge increases, which makes it, for example, characteristic of the religion of the Old Testament while love is the characteristic of the newer revelation, is quite erroneous. The most godlike patriarch, prophet, psalmist, could never fear God with a Holy Fear as does the Christian saint for they lacked the revelation of the Incarnation and the Crucifixion, the light-bestowing, personal indwelling of God the Holy Spirit. We misinterpret our Old Testament when we translate the various passages which speak of "the fear of the Lord" as being the "beginning of knowledge" or of "wisdom"<sup>5</sup>, as though they placed fear in a kindergarten relation to God, so to speak. The contexts of some of these passages are suggestive. "The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom"<sup>6</sup>. "For the fear of the Lord is wisdom and instruction; and in faith and meekness is his good pleasure. Disobey not the fear of the Lord"<sup>7</sup>. And the beautiful picture which the son of Sirach paints: "The fear of the Lord is glory, and exaltation, and gladness, and a crown of rejoicing. The fear of the Lord shall delight the heart, and give gladness, and joy, and length of days. Whoso feareth the Lord, it shall go well with him at the last, and in the day of his death he shall be blessed. To fear the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and it was created together with the faithful in the womb. With men she laid an eternal foundation; and with their seed shall she be had in trust.

---

<sup>5</sup>Prov. I: 7, 9: 10; Ps. III: 10, etc.

<sup>6</sup>Prov. 15: 33.

<sup>7</sup>Eccles. I: 27-28.



To fear the Lord is the fulness of wisdom”<sup>8</sup>. We see the phrase does not mean, exclusively at any rate, that the fear of the Lord is the commencement of Wisdom; it is truer to say that it is the end, “the fulness” of Wisdom. The Hebrew word “rosh” (literally “head”) has the sense of “beginning,” but it has also the sense of “zenith,” and using this latter sense we give the fullest rendering of the meaning of the passages. The highest and most perfect form of Wisdom, its final lesson, is to teach us the fear of the Lord; so we may correctly translate “The fear of the Lord is the end of Wisdom.” This translation serves, by the way, to abolish the old Calvinistic conception of God as One who is to be feared with a natural, human fear beyond that which we might feel in the presence of a tiger in the jungle. That interpretation rested in part upon a misunderstanding of the Old Testament teaching; happily it is now passing away, but its force is not yet wholly gone; in the course of its history it has probably repelled more souls from the Christian religion than any other single theory or fact in the Church’s long life. Some of the writers on the Gifts also have overlooked this thought that we derived from a closer study of the Old Testament, and have placed Fear first among the Gifts, thus introducing a confusion between fear and Holy Fear; the former, which is that of attrition, may turn a man towards God, but the latter is not merely a human emotion. Holy Fear cannot appear where Understanding, Wisdom, Knowledge, have not prepared the way for it; it belongs to the sphere of contrition and, consequently, is never outgrown, “it endureth forever,”<sup>9</sup> it is never put by as a thing belonging to our spirit-

---

<sup>8</sup>Ecclus. I:11-16

<sup>9</sup>Ps. 19:9.

ual childhood. St. Paul expresses the idea upon which we have been dwelling when he bids us "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work."<sup>10</sup> Other Gifts have taught us the nature of sin, Holy Fear fills us with a profound horror of sin and moves the will most effectively to avoid it, as it brings the human will into line with the Divine. We conclude, then, that Holy Fear is (a) positive, a "fountain of life," as the author of the Proverb<sup>11</sup> terms it, in which we find "strong confidence"; (b) it is sanctifying, for it causes us "to abhor that which is evil, and cleave to that which is good."<sup>12</sup> One might profitably treat of the Seven Gifts as remedies for the seven Deadly Sins, Holy Fear would then become the antidote for that which is chief among them—Pride; Lucifer fell because he lacked Holy Fear. How frequently does one still find this deadliest enemy of the soul's progress, **spiritual pride**, its presence often unsuspected, when Holy Fear is absent!

We have said that all the Gifts appear most perfectly, separately and in union, in the Person of our Lord, and there is no need to amend the statement in the case of this Gift—another evidence that it is not found only in connection with sin. While it is true that the Gift is not mentioned explicitly in the Gospel story of our Lord's life, we find its fruits in His entire life of prayer and worship, in the dependence of His human nature upon God, the submission of His human will to that of the Father. It operates in the cleansing of the Temple from the irreverence and disorder which had established themselves there, in the

---

<sup>10</sup>Phil. 2:12-13.

<sup>11</sup>Prov. 14:26-27.

<sup>12</sup>Rom. 12:9.

hatred of evil shown in the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees who had perverted and made human, so far as they could, the religion of Divine foundation. We return to the original prophecy of Isaiah and find it said of Him that "His delight shall be in the fear of the Lord."<sup>13</sup> The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of the ways in which He was perfected in the days of His flesh, tells us explicitly that "He was heard in that He fears."<sup>14</sup> The word used<sup>15</sup> is suggestive, it is not the common word for fear but one which in Christian usage expresses the highest reverence or piety, the underlying meaning in classical usage is the careful handling of a precious vessel, as a vase, which may easily be broken.

It is this Gift, united with the Divinely given Wisdom and Knowledge, that directs and sustains the Church in her corporate life as she has to deal with all the difficult questions of conduct and morals. As she is the Body of Christ she can never be untrue to her Head, never adopt a policy grounded upon a view-point which is not His, never act upon mere motives of expediency; always she must be guided by the light of the Spirit of Holy Fear. One has sadly to admit that this is a picture of an ideal seldom, if ever, realized, and that the Church all too often, in the present as in the past, hesitates in the face of questions of morals, political, social, individual, seeks the expedient, and is not influenced primarily by a Holy Fear against touching in any way the thing which is unclean so as to give it, seemingly, her sanction. We have our treasure in earthly vessels and often the content becomes flavored by

---

<sup>13</sup>Isa. II:3.

<sup>14</sup>Heb. 5:7.

<sup>15</sup>It occurs in only one other passage, Heb. 12:28.



the container. It is something, at any rate, that we would shrink from an open profession in a moral question of the advisability of following the opposed way of the expedient, such a profession as pagan philosophy did not hesitate to make when it descended from its mount of vision and had to deal with the actual, the concrete. The sects which in their conviction of an especial intimacy with God have minimized, or denied, their need of Holy Fear, have only, as Archbishop Benson says, "planted a religion on the ruins of morality"<sup>16</sup> and made certain their own downfall. Ideally the Church is indissolubly wedded to the eternal and immutable moral law of God. She is the guardian of the Moral Code with its long history beginning at Sinai and culminating in the Sermon on the Mount. She is prompted by Holy Fear to the propagation and enforcement of the moral teaching of her Founder. It can hardly be necessary here—the need is so obvious—to emphasize the gravity of the demand for the teaching of a Spirit of Holy Fear in connection with questions of chastity, that the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. Hardly less obvious is the need for the presentation of Holy Fear as an antidote to selfishness and corruption, profiteering and indifference to social injustice. Those who have borne the burden of oppression in the past are now seeking redress in the way the oppressors taught them and the foundations of our civilization are threatened; the good may fall together with the evil if the Church cannot make her voice heard and her teaching accepted, that the Fear of the Lord is the beginning, as well as the end, of political and social wisdom, the foundation stone upon which real liberty and

---

<sup>16</sup>The Seven Gifts, p. 179.

true equality rest. This truth she should preach fearlessly to all classes, for the restraining presence of Holy Fear is lacking in all alike. She will need all the Gifts of which we have thought and those of which we have still to think for her task, but it will remain unaccomplished unless she can succeed in persuading the world that the Fear of the Lord, as well as the Love of the Lord, is a reality that it must take into account. There is an evil greater than any other and that is that the Church should keep silent when the need of preaching Holy Fear is so exigent, that she should cry "Peace, Peace," when there is no peace apart from the message she has to proclaim, that she should content herself with platitudes is analogous to Nero's fiddling. Such silence on the part of the Church is to dam up the healing springs at their source.

Finally, we have to think of Holy Fear especially in connection with the upbuilding of the spiritual life in the individual, though such thought will involve some repetition of what has been already said. Holy Fear, we saw, is that which springs from and increases with real knowledge of God and of ourselves. The fear of God which is the Gift of God the Holy Ghost is that which self-examination in the conscious Presence of God begets; and out of such self-examination, in the light which the Holy Spirit supplies, grows real self-knowledge. It keeps us for the future away from occasions of sin, it makes us shun those persons, places, experiences, which we have in the past found dangerous to the soul's life. It teaches us the need for constant watchfulness, it convinces us that we can never afford to be off our guard, to lay our armor aside, for in the spiritual combat there is no truce. So St. Peter

warns us, "Be sober, be watchful; your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour."<sup>17</sup> It breeds in us a spirit of recollectedness and habitual self-control; it encourages us in perseverance, makes us realize the dread St. Paul had in mind when he wrote: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."<sup>18</sup> Observation of the spiritual shipwreck of others has taught us the same lesson, for

"The grey-haired saint may fail at last,  
The surest guide a wanderer prove;  
Death only binds us fast  
To the bright shore of love."<sup>19</sup>

So Holy Fear instills in us a wholesome distrust of self.

Secondly, Holy Fear is the fear which springs from awe and increases as we grow in the knowledge of God's love for us, by it we are kept from the hopelessness which comes through the knowledge of our repeated failures and shortcomings. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge: but the foolish despise wisdom and instruction";<sup>20</sup> it is the foolish who see only terror in the fear of the Lord and turning away from it make, as they think, the best of the certainties of this world and say, "Let us eat, drink, and be merry." It is self-knowledge that makes us realize our need of the Lord, and Holy Fear leads us to dread the loss of our chief Treasure as the

---

<sup>17</sup>I. St. Peter, 5:8.

<sup>18</sup>I. Cor. 9:27.

<sup>19</sup>Keble's Christian Year, Eighth Trinity.

<sup>20</sup>Prov. 1:7.



greatest misfortune that could come upon us. It gives us a very real horror of sin and changes our conception of the meaning of the term so that it is no longer merely negative; it gives us a view quite unlike that of the world, for "Holiness does not consist in the mere deliverance from sins, but in the presence of the Holy Spirit, and plenteousness of good work."<sup>21</sup>

Finally, Holy Fear is the fear which begets reverence as we learn more of God's Majesty and Holiness. "And when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as one dead."<sup>22</sup> It never lets us forget when we are speaking of His Church, its Faith, its Book, that we are upon Holy ground<sup>23</sup>; it teaches us never to make light of sacred things, it preserves us from that familiarity which the proverb says breeds contempt.

---

## The Practice of Fasting Communion

A PARISH PRIEST

ONE of the concomitants of the preaching missions which have become very common in the Church in recent years, and which seem to have accomplished enough in the direction of revived religious interest on the part of Church people to have gained official approval and recommendation, has been the parochial "question box." Through this means the faithful who desire to know if the witch of Endor really called up Samuel from the realms of the dead, or whether St. Paul or Henry VIII was the

---

<sup>21</sup>St. Chrys., Ep. ad Heb., Hom. 17 :4.

<sup>22</sup>Rev. 1 :17.

<sup>23</sup>See a sermon in Canon Liddon's "Sermons in Eastertide" on the text just cited.

founder of the Episcopal Church—in short all who are perplexed by any uncertainty in the realms of religious truth—may write out their questions and receive such satisfactory answers as the missionary or parish priest is able to give. The general utility of the “question box” as an instrument of dispelling doubt or settling religious difficulties is a subject entirely outside the scope of the present article. There can, however, be no doubt that for a priest newly settled in a parish the “question box” affords a quick and comparatively accurate indication of the religious training received by the people from previous pastors, and thus reveals to the new incumbent the sort of foundation upon which he may prepare to build up the spiritual life of the parish. Moreover the queries of laity may often incidentally indicate the shortcomings of the clergy and lead them better to fulfil their duties as guides and shepherds of God’s people.

Some time ago questions of the following purport were handed to the writer by a communicant of the parish of which he had been rector for a short period:

“1. Do we fast before receiving the Communion at the early celebration because Christ fasted before He instituted the Lord’s Supper? If not, why do we fast? 2. Should we be fasting when we receive the Holy Communion at a later hour in the morning?”

Since the person asking for answers to these questions had been prepared for confirmation some twelve years previous, it was evident at once that fasting communion had been taught in the parish for at least that length of time. It was however just as evident that the purpose and strict obligation of preserving a natural fast from the previous

midnight before partaking of the Blessed Sacrament had not been presented with sufficient definiteness to remove all doubt and question from the minds of the communicants.

In the short time at my disposal I could merely state, first of all that the motive underlying the custom of receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper fasting was the desire to pay this bodily tribute and reverence to the sacred gifts of the Body and Blood of Christ. In answer to the second question I of course replied that as members of the Catholic Church all churchmen are bound to receive the Holy Communion fasting, and that all those who recognized this obligation invariably fulfilled its precept, whether they received early in the morning or not until noon. I added that there is unfortunately a certain type of churchmen who either do not consider themselves bound by the laws of the Catholic Church, or who through ingrained prejudice or invincible ignorance regard the teaching of fasting communion as the fad of a few clergymen. Such persons in probable good faith and with a clear conscience partake of the Blessed Sacrament after having broken their fast, but all who believe and call themselves Catholics are careful to observe all the rules of the Catholic Church, in particular that which prescribes an absolute fast from food and drink and medicine from the previous midnight for all those who wish to receive the Holy Communion.

It has only been since I have had leisure to reflect more fully upon this question, which of course was answered at the time without any deliberation, that the inadequacy of my reply has become evident. For in addition to the two



classes of churchmen specified in my public answer, those who believe in the duty of fasting before partaking of the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ and those who do not, there is a third division, certainly in the ranks of priests and probably of laymen as well. They apparently believe in the obligatory nature of the law prescribing the reception of the Communion before common food, but do not translate their beliefs into practice. To use the figure of St. James, they appear to believe in fasting communion in about the same way as that in which Satan believes in God. They certainly believe and teach the continuity in all essentials of the Church of England from the date of its founding, through the reformation period, down to the present day; with no trace of doubt or uncertainty they assert that the American Episcopal Church is an integral part of the Catholic Church of Christ, and as such entitled to all the privileges and bound by all the laws and customs recognized by the ancient undivided Church and obeyed throughout the entire Catholic Church of the present, divided though it is. As an example of such an unquestioned law and custom of the Church from remote antiquity these priests would freely instance the prescription that a person must be fasting in order to partake of the Holy Communion; in preparing candidates for confirmation they do not neglect to teach the obligation connected with this universally recognized law of the Church, and urge their people always to receive at an early celebration when the observance of this regulation is subject to the least discomfort and inconvenience; under such circumstances, i. e. when no discomfort or inconvenience results, they are very careful to fast before celebrating the

Holy Sacrifice. But—and here is the strange fact—when-  
ever the observance of this Catholic custom does entail dis-  
comfort or inconvenience; if, for example, they have to  
celebrate twice on the same morning, and perhaps in addi-  
tion superintend the church school, preach a sermon, and  
teach a class, they consider themselves somehow or other  
dispensed from the law of fasting communion. They par-  
take of a breakfast, perhaps a very meager one, after the  
early celebration and before the more onerous work of the  
day begins. The effectiveness of a sermon on the one hand  
or the fear of a headache on the other are considered of  
more importance than the honor due the Body and Blood  
of Christ.

It is not necessary in order to bolster up a proof of  
these assertions to refer to the practice of clergymen who  
attribute no weight to and feel no obligation towards  
Catholic custom; who do not feel the instinctive reverence  
for holy things upon which the law of fasting communion  
is based. The instances which have come within the  
writer's experience and which are doubtless indicative of  
many more cases, are ample proof of this strange disre-  
gard for ecumenical law by priests who in practically  
every other particular deserve the respect and imitation  
of all their brethren.

For a number of years the parish of a small town in the  
middle west has been in charge of a priest of undoubted  
zeal and devotion and holiness. In spite of open opposition  
and petty persecution within his parish and the certainty  
of ridicule and danger of unpopularity among the public  
he has adhered consistently to the presentation of the  
Catholic faith. Only those who are familiar with small

towns of the middle west can appreciate the heroism and spirit of self-sacrifice necessary for any such course, as well as the courage and perseverance needed to gain any results. In this parish, purely as the result of the teaching of the present rector, the Blessed Sacrament is perpetually reserved on the high altar; the sacrament of penance is administered to an increasing number of penitents; the Holy Communion is received frequently and devoutly by the people; the obligation and blessings of fasting communion are taught to all. The priest however invariably eats breakfast before his late celebration.

To this example might be added that of a second priest whom the writer is proud to know and bound to honor. He varies from the first in every personal characteristic but is animated by the same spirit of loyalty and devotion to our Blessed Lord and to the Church for which He died. His field of work is entirely different, not in the small parish of a small town, but in a rather typical "fashionable" parish of a large city. It would be no exaggeration to state that as a result of his example and teaching the power of personal religion has begun to revolutionize his parish, the privileges and duties of churchmen are being learned, the grace of the sacraments is being sought more and more. This priest too always communicates fasting when the celebration comes before the breakfast hour and never when it is scheduled for a later time.

For a third instance reference might be made to the former rector of a parish of entirely different type, where generations of faithful priests and laity had impressed the stamp of catholicity beyond danger of eradication. All the externals of worship were indicative of the training



of the people. There was a daily mass, a sung mass with incense every Sunday, and every other accessory of catholic worship. Not a person in the parish would have thought of approaching the altar without careful preparation, cleansed if necessary of mortal sin through the sacrament of penance, having fasted from the previous midnight. The priest was the single exception. At the late mass on Sundays his silk chasuble invariably covered a full stomach; a hearty breakfast had fortified him for the arduous task of swinging the censer. He had obtained, so he is reported to have said, a dispensation from the rule of fasting communion from five bishops. Whether on the strength of these he ate five breakfasts or only one cannot, of course, be stated with any pretense of accuracy.

If these more or less isolated instances are at all representative of the actual practice of the American clergy, there is certainly a widespread need of emphasizing a duty which should be self-evident—that those who call themselves Catholics ought to act like Catholics and in particular observe that undoubted law of the Catholic Church which dictates the observance of a natural fast from the previous midnight as a prerequisite for the reception of the Holy Communion.

It is irrelevant and unnecessary to prove the antiquity and desirability of this law. Those priests who have a special interest in the practices of the ancient Church can find ample testimony to the early observance of this custom in the writings of Tertullian, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, and other ancient authors. The early and universal spread of this custom and the recognition of the obligation of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ before all earthly food was so natural and instinctive a

recognition of the honor and respect due the heavenly gifts as to need no labored defense to those who believe in the reality of the inward part in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is enough to know that the law of fasting communion was recognized and obeyed in the Church of England as well as in the rest of the Catholic Church before the reformation. As the Anglican Church has never made any attempt to alter this rule of the Catholic Church, of which she claims to be a part, it is certainly binding upon all churchmen, English and American. It is very shallow and superficial to claim all the privileges of Catholics without assuming their responsibilities; there is a manifest appearance of unreality in the assertion that the Roman Catholic Church in England and America is a schismatic body when in many respects their clergy and people have a higher regard for the laws of Catholic Christendom than prevails in the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church.

It is true, of course, that the law of fasting communion is of ecclesiastical and not of divine origin. It is a ceremonial or positive and not a moral law, and therefore may admit of exception in the same way as the obligation of Friday abstinence or that of refraining from servile work and assisting at the Holy Sacrifice on the Lord's Day. Catholic custom admits without question the right of a person in danger of death to receive the Blessed Sacrament even though he is not fasting. It is also conceivable that under unusual circumstances a person who is not fasting might be under such a grave obligation of receiving the Holy Communion that the lesser duty of fasting communion would have to yield to the greater. But for a

priest deliberately to break his fast with the full intention of celebrating the Holy Communion a few hours later is in utter contravention of the law and custom of the Church and overthrows every claim he might make of loyalty and allegiance to the historic Church of Christ.

It is unnecessary to consider in detail the excuses which are commonly made for this disregard of ecclesiastical regulation. As a rule the admitted difficulty of fasting until noon is exaggerated into an impossibility. It is seriously asserted that a priest of the twentieth century is unable to perform a morning's work on an empty stomach, when our ancestors of a few centuries back invariably did half a day's manual labor before they broke their fast. In fact, many a farmer or farmer's wife of the present day expends more physical energy in the "chores" done before breakfast than a priest has to exert on his busiest Sunday.

Another rather naive excuse for eating breakfast before the late celebration was set forth by a priest who stated that, inasmuch as a priest was not supposed to offer the Holy Sacrifice more than once on any day, his second celebration was entirely without the province of Catholic regulation, and that therefore the law of fasting communion did not apply to it. It is almost impossible to believe that such an argument could be advanced by the clergyman of a Church which aims to have a priesthood possessed of both intellectual sanity and moral stability. The many priests who do obey this law of the Church and suffer no physical ill effects are ample proof of the invalidity of all the excuses commonly proffered.



As a fellow priest I would therefore urge as forcibly as possible upon all who regard themselves as Catholic priests and ask others to consider them as such, that they allow nothing to interfere with their observance of the law which prescribes fasting communion. Elaborate ceremonial, vestments, lights, incense, and the like externals of our heritage, valuable though they are, may be the manifestations of the mere aesthete. In isolated instances exaggerated emphasis upon such things may even hinder rather than forward the acceptance of the Catholic faith by the people as a whole. Fasting communion, since by its very nature it is hidden from men, will neither tickle the taste of the superficial ritualist nor arouse the opposition of the most recalcitrant Protestant. It springs from but one motive—reverence for the Body and Blood of Christ. Before a priest can expect his people to receive fasting at an early celebration he must himself receive fasting at every celebration. Like the worthy parson of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales," he must base his instructions upon and enforce them by the example he himself sets.

The priest who resolutely sets out to practice what he preaches by observing this binding law may, of course, experience some physical discomfort until he has become accustomed to this change in his customs. In time, as the new routine becomes a matter of fixed habit, this will pass away. But, regardless of the ease or difficulty with which he obeys the Catholic law of fasting communion, he will receive the recompense that always comes with the faithful performance of duty. His Father who seeth in secret shall reward him openly.

# The Unspoken Revelation

BY CAROLINE FRANCES LITTLE

**I**N the epistle for Christmas Day we read that "God, Who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, Whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by Whom He made the world." The spoken revelation of God culminated in the Incarnation, when "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," and once for all delivered the Faith to the saints.

But what is the unspoken revelation of the power and majesty of Almighty God, which from the foundation of the world has been made manifest to all nations? What material for thought is found in the nineteenth Psalm!

"The heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament sheweth His handy-work.

"One day telleth another: and one night certifieth another.

"There is neither speech nor language: but their voices are heard among them.

"Their sound is gone out into all lands: and their words into the ends of the world."

Not the most ignorant savage of interior Africa, or the remotest province of China, but can lift his eyes to the starry firmament, and know in his inmost soul that there is a God. All through ancient history, Biblical as well as secular, we see that the heavens were universally studied, many tribes worshipping the sun and moon. Astrologers were resorted to for information regarding the future,

and even educated people sought the casting of their horoscopes. In Isaiah we read, "Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators stand up, and save thee from those things that shall come upon thee." When God answered Job out of the whirlwind, He asked, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?"

"Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?"

It was Job, who said, "He hangeth the earth upon nothing"; and when the foundations of the earth were laid, we read that "The morning stars sang together," and we know that the Greeks were wont to speak of the music of the spheres. The blue sun Vega, a star of the first magnitude, must have been studied in prehistoric times, for she was known to the Chinese, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman astronomers as well as to other ancient people. Whoever has seen, in the small hours of the night, Venus, glowing and scintillating with her wonderful white light, appreciates the force of our Lord's declaration when He said, "I am the bright and Morning Star." For radiant as she is now, our evening star, with ruddy Mars close beside her, yet she does not equal her matin splendor.

Balam prophesied, "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel"; and meditation upon this must have led the Magi to recognize a Divine revelation in the Star, which finally stood over the house where the Infant King rested in the arms of His Mother. Among the countless orbs which fill the firmament, it is strange that God should have chosen our little world, in which to reveal Himself in the Incarnation.



Isaiah says of our earth, that God "Hath established it. He created it not in vain. He formed it to be inhabited."

In the past few years the science of astronomy has made vast strides in knowledge, opening up wonderful fields of light. Suns, planets, spiral nebulæ, and dark bodies revolving in limitless space, float upon the telescopic vision. It is said of Herschel that he broke through the barriers of the sky, but what wonderful advance has been made even since his day. The Chaldeans, the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Hindoos, those ancients, who long before the Christian Era, possessed extensive astronomical knowledge, could not have dreamed of the wonderful refracting and reflecting telescopes which modern skill has achieved. The largest refractor in the world is the Yerkes, with a lens measuring forty inches; and the observatory at Mount Wilson, California, is the proud possessor of the great reflecting telescope with a hundred inch lens.

In the words of Schiaparelli, "Astronomy is the science of infinity and eternity"; and Richter says, "The spirit of man acheth with this infinity." Is the universe infinite? Our minds cannot comprehend it. But if it be not infinite, what lies beyond it? How petty to the devout astronomer are the little mundane affairs which occupy the attention of the majority of mankind! But our minds have thrilled over the recent announcement of the great size of Betelgeuse, and now many, with an interest not before felt, gaze nightly at the constellation of Orion. One's brain reels before the figures, when we know that it would take 27,000,000 of our sun to equal the size of this Alpha Orionis. Now also comes the startling information that a long photographic exposure reveals the fact that Dryfus

584, a spiral nebular having its own proper motion, is speeding away from us at the rate of 1100 miles per second, and that it is millions of light years distant. Can one study the stars and doubt the existence of God? A modern astronomer, whose soul is full of religious and poetic thought, says:

“He who watches from his world yon star-gems bright,  
Resplendent beacons, sparkling low and high,  
Should stand most humbly and responsively,  
As though the God of life and death were nigh,  
Who guides the Planet-home of you and me,  
And steers the stars throughout Eternity.”

In the words of Gregory the Great, “The wonders of the visible creation are the foot-prints of our Creator. Himself we cannot see, but we are on the road that leads to vision, when we admire Him in the things that He has made.” The author of *A Parson's Defence* says, “I regard the approach to God through Nature, as a partial, and un-conscious, or sub-conscious Christianity.” The Immanence, the Presence of God in His visible creation is a truth in which we must believe; for “In Him we live, and move, and have our being.” Wordsworth caught the fire from the Divine Immanence when he wrote:

. . . . . “Here you stand  
Adore and worship when you know it not,  
Pious beyond the intention of your thought,  
Devout above the meaning of your will.”

Yet from out the starry firmament must come the final doom of our planet. Nineteen hundred years ago our Blessed Lord said that we would see “signs in the sun, and

in the moon, and in the stars." Already astronomers see signs in the stars; for when we read of the discovery of another Nova, it is only the final conflagration of some distant orb, burning up, until it is resolved into a whirling nebular, or, perhaps as a cold, dark body, it goes on rushing through space. In the so-called new stars we read the doom of our world; for if there should be a cataclysm in our sun, or should we collide with some other body, we must be destroyed. Our solar system is travelling towards Vega and her blue companion; and she, the Queen of our summer skies, is hastening to us with a velocity of ten miles per second. Alpha Centauri is sailing towards us at the rate of twelve or fourteen miles a second, but it would be a long time before she could reach our system. "Yet," says a recent writer, "in that space outside our solar system, there may exist a vast number of invisible bodies, and one or more of them may be closer than we are aware. If one the size of our earth were a billion of miles away, its presence would not be discovered. Speeding at the rate of a hundred miles a second, it would, other conditions being right, reach us in about thirty-three years, so it is possible that some of us may perish in a collision with a foreign planet."

The fixed date for the End is known only to Almighty God, and we can neither hasten, nor retard it. St. Peter said, "The Day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in which the heavens will pass away with a great noise; and the elements shall melt with fervent heat." And Christ declares that "The stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken; and then shall appear the Sign of the Son of Man in the heavens."



The Church is not placed in this world to make it a better place to live in, but to prepare the souls of men for the Judgment Day, for "our citizenship is in heaven." Before the End there will be wars, famines, and earthquakes, a falling away from the Faith, and a disbelief in the Second Coming of Christ. All these signs are daily transpiring before our eyes. In the Prayer of Consecration the priest says that the holy Sacrifice is to be offered until His Coming again: and thus is made, daily before the Altar, a memorial of the Second Advent. The Church never loses sight of every side of the Truth.

As the unspoken story of the beginnings of our little earth is indelibly written in the rocks, by the finger of the Creator, and the panorama is unrolled for us by geologists and biologists, so its end and doom is revealed to us in the silent language of the stars; for "Their sound is gone out into all lands; and their words into the ends of the world." How fitting for public and private use is this matchless collect by Bishop Cosin: "Grant us, we beseech Thee, that having this hope, we may purify ourselves, even as He is pure: that when He shall appear again with power and great glory, we may be made like unto Him, in His eternal and glorious kingdom."

---

## Letters from A Layman, II

DEAR J——

——Variety and latitude in ceremonial are features of our church that vitalize it, and we are fortunate and should be thankful. Standardization, as Father B—— said, would destroy this life element which gives a freshness

and youthfulness to the Church that we quite likely overlook and forget, but I do want to register one exception. I am sure Father B— will accept it. I know you will; and I wish that the church schools and seminaries could be persuaded to pay attention to it.

My exception is the slackness with which the English of the daily offices of the Church are read. I should like to see the effort to correct that latitude in ceremonial standardized and nailed to the curriculum. It seems to me that in the long run, a training in the appreciation and rendition of as beautiful English as the world possesses is as useful as a course in the Thirty-nine Articles.

For example, I heard . . . say low mass the other day. He is an able man, and earnest, but I wish he could have knelt by us and listened to himself slack the glory of the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church Militant, and the sweet comfort of the Absolution. He did better with the Consecration, but after that it was, I regret to report, a home run. I recognized again the true answer to a question a Protestant friend asked me. He said: "Why do you Episcopalians stare around so nonchalantly while your prayers are being said?" I replied: "Because we are sure they are being listened to," which I felt at the time was quite a good answer to a Protestant query. But the real fact is that we listen nonchalantly because the prayers are being read nonchalantly. The law of interest is, that to be interesting, one must be interested. Remember this, and the next time you find people staring around, concentrate on the prayers yourself, and put your life and soul into them, and see what happens.

And they are so beautiful in themselves, that when some-

one reads them even with a semi-attention to their music and meaning they hold the ear and the mind from wandering. I remember low masses in parish churches that were as solemn and beautiful as full orchestra celebration in great cathedrals. All that made them so was the music and peace of the noble rhythms recognized and voiced by the priest at the altar. I went to such a mass Ash Wednesday morning. The service leapt into life because the priest lived it in his words.

And I think the same thing is often true of the choral masses and evensongs. Somebody told me, or I read somewhere, that intoning originated when in the early Church or maybe in the synagogue, the priests found, that in order to be heard they had either to shout or to sing. So they naturally chose the latter, and intoned. If this is true—and it may be—why is it not worth while to proceed on that assumption, and intone so that we can hear the words as well as the tones? It can be done, and I have heard priests sing high mass so clearly that every word rang as true as if they had spoken it. A bishop of the English Church who recently celebrated high mass in a New York church sings mass with so nice an enunciation that every word sounds distinct, yet the music of it is perfect.

So both can be done. And are n't they worth doing? It seems to me that what Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch says about style in writing is equally true about this. He defines style in writing as being courteous to your reader. In other words, cultivating a good style in writing is only cultivating good manners.

The trouble starts I imagine in the preparatory schools. At any rate, that would be a good place to begin correcting



it. Then carry along the good work to the seminaries. Surely the appeal to good manners will have a prompt response in those circles. It is fair to estimate that the words of the Prayer Book services are as beneficial to the pews as are the thoughts of the sermon. I am willing to leave out entirely the possibility of their being as interesting, and I have found comparatively little difficulty in distinguishing the articulation of the sermons. N.

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*A People's Life of Christ.* By J. Patterson-Smyth, LL.D., D.C.L. New York, 1920. Fleming H. Revell Co.

Dr. Patterson-Smyth has written three or four little books on "How we got Our Bible," and on the "Hereafter," which have proved both useful and popular. Perhaps that may prove true of the present volume, and at any rate it is quite orthodox and harmless. But it adds nothing by way of elucidation and illustration to the Gospel narratives and your reviewer is unable to see why anyone should prefer this book to them. It may help our readers to fix its rank if we mention the fact that the frontispiece is the head of Christ from a well-known Hoffmann picture. C. C. E.

*Aspects of Christian Character. A Study of the Beatitudes.* By J. Howard B. Masterman, M.A. With an introduction by the Bishop of London. London, 1921. Longmans, Green & Co.

This is the book written for the people of the Bishop of London to read in Lent, 1921. It is very good, and meaty and thought-provoking; but the people of London must be far, far above the average of the people of any diocese on this side of the water, to be able to profit by it. We cannot imagine a man in the street, in any street, reading it through. Browning, Shelley, words in Greek, brilliant expressions like "Faith is no anaemic virtue placidly waiting for the good that it seeks" (with a diphthong in anaemic) could hardly be of spiritual help for Lent in New York. It might be, for a priests' retreat. P. R. F.

*The Behavior of Crowds*, by Everett Dean Martin. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1920, pp. 303, index.

Mr. Martin is "Lecturer in Social Philosophy and Director of the Cooper Union Forum of the People's Institute of New York." He would seem to be an individualist convinced that we can best improve by having human beings refuse to act like human beings and act instead like animated intellects. To him the statement that man is a social being is not merely a statement of fact: it is a confession of weakness. He insists, to be sure, in his last paragraph, that such a "free spirit" as he longs for is "truly social;" that "he contributes to the social not a copy or an imitation, not a childish wish-fancy furtively disguised, but a psychic reality and a new creative energy;" he becomes a true citizen in the "Republic of the Free." All of this merely means that man may possibly hope some day, having lost all sense of brotherhood, all enjoyment of ritual of state or religion, all hope of Heaven either mundane or superhuman—for these good things are nothing to our author but wretched crowd complexes in which we hide our individual inferiorities,—develop into a race of smilingly self-sufficient intellectual Brahmins. For those who like to contemplate a society wholly made up of such citizens, let us leave this dream. It would bore this reviewer most exceedingly, and many other normal persons. This may be because we are descended from the Simians. And then again it may be because we are the sons of God.

It is interesting to see how Mr. Martin, having ruthlessly decried millenia of all sorts, from "the Co-operative Commonwealth" to "the Communion of Saints," concludes by presenting his own millennial state, this "Republic of the Free." Since the tendency to dream of Paradise has revealed itself even in Mr. Martin, possibly it is somehow bound up with human nature and therefore may be not quite unintelligent and weak. But if, as the author says, belief in social states yet hoped for is a means whereby the believer seeks to flatter his self-esteem by transferring the virtues of his dream society to his unappreciated and defective self, just what sort of person would Mr. Martin find himself if, in the face of this concept of an intellectual "Republic of the Free," he psycho-analyzed himself? One hates to be cruel; but a little cruelty may not be amiss toward a man who calmly assumes that all the dreams, religious or secular, of men and women are only our crude attempts to escape from our own subconscious sense of being defectives.

Mr. Martin has tried to present a new analysis of crowd psychology, —to adapt Freud to "folksiness." Nothing much, in the way of facts as distinct from phraseology, has been added to Le Bon's earlier work, "The Crowd." This present volume is ingenious, and interesting in spots, but possibly one may say, without fear of offence, that it is the mental product of a man who might profit by a sense of humor.

—BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

---

*The College and New America.* By Jay William Hudson, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, University of Missouri. N. Y., Appleton, 1920, pp. xi+202.

This is an unusually readable study of our educational faults, not lacking in humor, and rather rich in suggestions for an effective plan of improvement.

Professor Hudson finds that the present failure of the college to realize its potential importance as a force for a better world is chiefly caused by the lack of a definite aim. College education fails to train men for life because life is too vague in the minds of most teachers unless expressed in practically concrete terms. The aim suggested for American education is "to produce a definite American social order, in relation to a definite world order" so that subjects would not be taught for their academic value alone, but would have contact with life, and power to work for the correction of the ills of society. The primary agents for this change would be the teachers, the most glowing results for the individual student would be a more vital interest in the subjects of study and an effectual training for life.

—J. R. L.

---

*Monophysitism Past and Present. A Study in Christology.* By A. A. Luce, M.C., D.D., Captain late 12th Royal Irish Rifles: Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. London: S. P. C. K. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920, pp. 142.

The writer of this illuminating essay believes that "the study of heresy is the best guide to orthodox Christology" and also declares that the type of heresy here criticized is not "an oriental antique" or "a curiosity of the intellect," but a system of thought which exists today. It rests on a philosophy which, whether recognized or not, is in fact its necessary basis. And a similar statement applies to the Nestorian and the Catholic views. Each of the three competing interpretations of Christ is grounded in a



philosophy of its own, and in each case also the philosophy applies to a particular view of the Cosmic Problem—the relation between God and the world. There are three possible solutions here. The first and lowest is dualism—God *and* the world—one expression of which is ordinary deism. The Christological counterpart of this dualistic conception is of course Nestorianism. The second is monism—God *is* the world—or pantheism, which in Christology gives us Monophysitism. The third solution is theism conserving the proper identity of both God and the world, with their difference and their union. Applied to the Christological Problem this finds expression in the Catholic doctrine of One Person and the Two natures of our Lord. This condensation of the author's preliminary discussion in his opening chapter by no means does justice to the parallelism he exhibits, but it will at least serve to indicate the plan and purpose of the essay. When he says that Monophysitism is "grounded in the nature of the human mind" he refers to the universal craving for unity and synthesis. This is the secret of the fascination which both materialism and pantheism have exerted in the past, and still exert today. They meet the demand for a single ultimate principle. In like manner the demand for some easy and simple solution of the problem of Christ was bound to assert itself. The clumsy attempt of Arius took the form of minimizing His Godhead. The Monophysite heresy tends to obscure the truth of His Manhood. Both, though from opposite sides, deny the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation which reached its full and exact expression in the Chalcedonian formula. It will be perceived that there is a distinct advantage in this particular line of approach to the great theological problem. From this point of view Christology can no longer be regarded as an isolated theme or be relegated to a small body of narrow specialists. It lies, as our author points out, in the main stream of the current of human thought. For which reason the book before us should appeal to a much wider constituency than its title suggests. The intelligent reader will discover as he follows the singularly clear and lucid argument here presented how the study of an old-time heresy may be highly illuminating to vital interests of the present day which are rarely associated with theological controversy. It is also quite possible that before the conclusion is reached he may view in new perspective the relation of religion to the common life.

But the importance of the book appears further in its serious attempt to explain the Chalcedonian teaching by the assistance of Bergsonian psycho-

logy, employing the interpenetration of psychic states and the distinction between deep-seated and superficial consciousness. An attractive line of inquiry is here opened up with possible results of a very far-reaching character should the author's conclusions finally be approved. In such event we can see the intrusion of a new element in the critical treatment of the Gospel narrative. Of course no positive hint of this is given by the essayist and any such digression from his immediate subject would be out of place. Whether he succeeds or fails in his contention, his effort is noteworthy and for several reasons significant. Not a few writers in our day have labored assiduously to create the impression that the orthodox formula is a *cul de sac*—usually by the reiterated assertion that it gets us nowhere—and others unwittingly have played into their hands by a view of its finality which, though apparently reverent, really dishonors it. The fact that it steers between Scylla and Charybdis, delimiting truth from possible error on either side, does not mean that it operates to discourage all devout speculative inquiry. An approved safeguard, it gives us our bearings and becomes a secure point of departure. This has been exemplified more than once in recent years. It is exemplified here. The writer is perfectly satisfied with the terminology of the creeds, and merely aims to show that the Church's faith in Christ can be psychologically justified on Bergsonian lines, in a word, that we have an intellectual basis for the possibility of two natures in our Lord and support for the independent reality of His personality. Incidentally and by the same test the specious fallacies of Monophysitism are exposed. It would of course be quite a gratuitous supposition to imagine that the integrity of the faith depends upon any sort of philosophical speculation, still less that it must stand or fall by the ultimate fate of M. Bergson's psychological doctrines. Dr. Luce is careful at the outset to repudiate any such inference. The fact remains that he has exhibited certain outstanding features of mutual congeniality and correspondence in the two view-points sufficiently striking to compel attention and substantial enough to rule out of court the confident assertion that Chalcedon is hopelessly out of date.

We find ourselves less in sympathy with some of the minor points of the essay. The writer attempts to relate Monophysitism to many errors of belief and practice, and, we are bound to say, in more than one instance seems to have wandered too far afield for his illustrations. We are interested

but not convinced when told that "mysticism and monophysitism are twin systems." The heresy is related also to such diverse things as a bald rationalism and the position occupied by the advocates of Church disestablishment! Again, "Monasticism is applied monism" and, by implication, finds itself at home in monophysitism as nowhere else. But we reflect that Nestorius as well as Eutyches was a monk, not to mention the fact that in all the ages religious orders have flourished in the Catholic Church: also that modern monophysitism where it is at all influential gives no countenance to asceticism. The fact that of old the two were frequently boon companions hardly justifies this part of the author's description of "The Ethos of Monophysitism."

But aside from a few things like these, which do not affect the integrity of the main argument, we have only words of praise for this stimulating book. It concludes with a very pertinent and earnest plea that in our habitual thought and devotion we should ever aspire to a deeper realization of the perfect humanity of our Lord.

T. B. F.

---

*Spiritism and The Fallen Angels.* By James M. Gray, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company. 1920.

"That mediums can receive communications from another world there is no doubt, nor is there any doubt that their communications are from evil spirits, for the Bible confirms both propositions." These words are an excellent summary of what this book tries to teach. There is one very impressive thing about the book, and that is its bringing together into small compass all the texts of the Bible which seem to refer to spirits, and especially to evil spirits. In those texts there is a mass of evidence bearing upon Spiritism, of great extent and of primary importance. The interpretation of those texts is difficult; but the tendency of our time has been to make their interpretation impossible by an unwillingness to admit the existence of evil spirits. Such an attitude is a denial of the scientific temper. As the Society for Psychical Research has vigorously fought for the doctrine that it is unscientific to deny the possibility of communication with the dead, so the church, as the custodian of Holy Scripture, may well fight for the doctrine that it is unscientific to deny the possibility of evil spirits as the causes of Spiritistic phenomena and of moral phenomena as well. And we should add to scientific open-mindedness, our confident belief as



Christians in the importance of Holy Scriptures. The words of the inspired writers, and above all, the words of Our Lord, in the matter of evil spirits as well as in other things, "were written for our learning," and doubtless for our warning.

The mass of Scriptural evidence which this book brings together, is very poorly handled. The order of presentation is not logical, but topical, and the author constantly repeats himself and anticipates himself. But much worse is the irresponsible mingling of reason and conjecture, which is calculated to make intelligent readers throw down the book in disgust.

---

*The Body Is One.* An Introduction to the Problems of Christian Unity. By Rev. C. Beaufort Moss. Sometime Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford. S. P. C. K. 1920. pp. 144.

This small volume is a study book dealing with present-day divisions in the light of their origin. The main purpose is to impart knowledge in a simple manner and to furnish facts for profitable discussion. It is taken for granted that reunion when it comes will be reunion in the Catholic faith.

The first third of the book gives a sketch of church history up through the Reformation. A profound change, aside from the break up of Christian unity at this period, was the introduction of an entirely new kind and type of Christianity. A discussion then follows in turn as to the situation as regards reunion by our communion with Rome, the eastern churches, and the Protestant sects. Each are studied in the light of three conditions. "First there must be a general desire for it (re-union) on both sides; Secondly, there must be unity of belief in fundamentals; thirdly, there must be adjustment of the practical difficulties caused by schism."

Little hope of reunion with Rome is found as no one of the three conditions are met. The author also seems to feel that the decrees of the Vatican Council are an insurmountable hindrance. He narrates the various attempts in the past to bring about reunion. The most probable way of accomplishing it is given as that of reunion accomplished through national churches which may be set up. The situation as regards the eastern churches is far more encouraging. Patience and continued good will can shortly accomplish it. Reunion with non-conformists presents a more difficult position. In the first place reunion is often desired from inadequate

motives. Then there is the difficulty of understanding each other's point of view especially when each has a different religious vocabulary. Most fundamental is the fact of no unity of belief. "If only we will stop thinking in terms of 'our common Christianity,' 'one United Church of the Empire,' and other sentimental but misleading phrases, and keep steadily before our eyes the right way of approach, first the spirit of charity, then unity of belief, then practical adjustment and intercommunion last of all, we need not despair that the broken fabric of English Christianity will in time be restored to unity and peace."

The chief conclusion of the book is that there is no short cut to unity, for sin is the real cause of schism. Since this is so, reunion must be preceded by spiritual revival. Our unique position in Christendom makes us capable of gathering the scattered members of Christ's flock but we must examine our own fitness. Our own faults must be amended before we can be reconciled with others. Chiefest of these faults are the lack of unity among ourselves in matters of belief, the lack of charity, and the lack of discipline in matters of denial of the faith. Above all the need is for a new spirit and a new heart.

The author has gathered much compact information into a small book. His bibliographies at the end of the chapters are useful. In a word he has rendered a service to those who are interested in the matter of reunion but who have neither the historical background nor the opportunity to study the whole situation in all its aspects.

---

*The Meaning of Holy Baptism.* By the Reverend C. H. K. Boughton, D.D. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1920. Pp. 96.

In this exposition the attempt is made to reconcile with the language of the Prayer Book that conception of "Regeneration" which identifies it with "Conversion" or "Repentance." As might be imagined, this is a task requiring considerable ingenuity.

The author's great fear is that some magical power may be attributed to Holy Baptism when it is regarded as the instrument of regeneration; as if, forsooth, there were danger of supposing its immediate effect to be the conversion of its recipients. Accordingly, our use of the term "regenerate" as applied to the baptized is "with a much diminished meaning," or "only in a formal sense." In fact, from his point of view, "Regeneration" is one

thing and "Baptism" another—the former the work of the Spirit; the latter that of the church. It follows that Baptism is the seal, either of a regeneration (conversion) which has already been experienced, or may come to pass some time in the future—or, may never occur. This simple explanation, he thinks, "illuminates much otherwise doubtful language in our Prayer Book" (p. 61) or, "it will help us to steer a straight course through the otherwise difficult waters of the English Baptismal Offices." (p. 69).

Little seems called for by way of comment. The author would have been spared much needless trouble if only as a preliminary to his study he had made himself acquainted with the theology of the sacraments and, in particular, with the history of the baptismal controversy. T. B. F.

---

*The Problem of Christian Unity.* By Various Writers, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1920, pp. 134.

The Church Unity Foundation sponsors these seven addresses, five by denominational speakers, and two by bishops of our church. The addresses are brief; but they seem fairly representative. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman opens the discussions with an address on "Can the Divided Church Meet the Challenge of the Present World Crisis?" The question is barely stated by the author; and certainly he has not answered it. There is, of course, much of the same kind of talk that we have heard, until we weary of it, about the church—here "both Catholicism and Protestantism" being on trial. We earnestly wish some one who holds this view will some time give to the world an explanation of it that will be "understood of the people." Naturally no Catholic can be expected to accept a definition such as the following "That is true Catholicity which sees in the past, the present, and the future of the *Ecclesia* the outworking of one Divine Design, slowly appearing beneath the wear and waste of human agencies."

Bishop Garland's address on "Steps Toward Organic Unity: The Present Situation" is the best in the volume. Its summary of work accomplished along the lines of Church Unity in various parts of the world is accurate, and gives some foundation for an optimistic outlook.

Professor McGiffert deals with "Causes Leading up to Divinity." Naturally a church historian will be accurate in historical statements, though we may not always agree with his conclusions. We must confess we are deeply interested in the analysis of the Protestant Reformation given in passing. "Obstacles in the Way" are discussed by Dr. William F. Mc-



Dowell. The best thing he says is that the first obstacle in the way of reunion is the lack of definition. He gives as a concrete example of this the failure of the efforts to reunite Methodists, North and South. Ecclesiastical inertia, doubt, lack of a satisfactory plan of unity and other practical matters are touched upon in a manner to show that in the question of reunion all is not plain sailing. Mr. Speer's address on the unity in the mission field shows how denominations holding much the same doctrinal, devotional and governmental standards have united in the mission field. Unions of various kinds of Presbyterians with each other and with the two Reformed Bodies and Congregationalists, e.g., have been accomplished; and such unions are quite useful and natural. When the various Evangelical Protestant bodies in the home lands as well as the mission field have come together and can present a united Protestantism to the church, then the time will have come for further steps, provided the Catholic churches will also have been reunited. But any scheme of "county," "federation," to say nothing of actual unity of any Catholic church with any or all bodies of Protestants would place a serious barrier in the way of Catholic reunion, which must, to our mind, be a preliminary step to reunion with Protestantism. Dr. Coffin's address on *The Mind of the Master* is the weakest in the volume, giving but little on the mind of Christ and a great deal of that of the writer. We must repudiate his view, tintured by critical "scholarship" on our Lord's outlook on the future, especially as to the nearness of His Second Advent, and the statement that our Lord did not "found an institution, i.e., a church. Bishop Talbot, who speaks on "The Next Step," unfortunately was not familiar with the other addresses. He dwells on the great desire for unity; but he very properly concludes that "Church Unity cannot come until the spirit of Christian unity has become so strong as to be irresistible." He finds the beginnings of unity in the plan for Union adopted by the American Council of Churches and in the Concordat proposed between our church and certain Congregational leaders.

The Rev. Dr. Lynch has written an introduction. On the whole, this volume is rather mediocre. Little that is new has been brought forward to strengthen the cause of church unity. Nor can the reader find much to clarify his thought on the subject; and whoever seeks a really practical and helpful discussion will find himself disappointed in this volume.

F. C. H. W.

*Our Family Affairs*, by E. F. Benson. G. H. Doran Company.

There is a great deal of charm in this volume, as the author is one who has had unusual opportunities to observe events and people in interesting quarters of the world, and has the gift of setting down his impressions in lucid and graphic English. The point of especial value to churchmen is the exposition of the character of the author's father, Archbishop Benson, and the side-light shed on the development of Robert Hugh Benson. The Archbishop's untiring service to God and state, his fits of black depression, the terrifically overcharged Sunday observance which he inflicted on his family, the fear in which his children held him,—all are set down without any apparent effort of delineation. To offset this there are many passages of pure joy,—both humorous, as in the scenes at Cambridge, and sheerly charming, as in the pictures of jolly swims and rides and tramps which loom so large in the author's life from boyhood to the present. The things which appeal most deeply to the author,—the descriptions of his mother, his sisters, the death of his father,—are treated with a masterly restraint; their simplicity is the highest form of artistic writing. Throughout the book one recognizes vivid spots from "David Blaize," "Michael," "The Babe, B.A.," and "Up and Down." Whether one is fond of the churchly side of these memoirs, or the interesting people involved, or the delight of watching an attractive family of children grow up, one can revel in a book written in perfect English and with faultless taste, with none of the cheap sensationalism of which memoirs have been so full of late.

E. L. C.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's "City of God."* By John Neville Figgis, Litt.D. Late of the Community of the Resurrection. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1921, pp. 132.

*David Hummell Greer, Eighth Bishop of New York.* By Charles Lewis Slattery, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co. New York, 1921, pp. xiii, 321.

*The Parish—Its Life, Its Organization, Its Teaching Mission and Its Divine Contacts.* A Handbook for the Clergy and Laity. By Rev. William



A. R. Goodwin, D.D. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, pp. xiii, 136.

*Johannine Writings*—*Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications*, XIX. By A. Nairne, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1918, pp. 114.

*Heroes and Kings*—*Bible Readings for Schools*. By Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. London, E. C., pp. 168.

*The Control of Parenthood*—*Edited by James Marchant, LL.D., C.H.E., F.R.S., Ed.* Secretary of the National Birth-Rate Commission. Introduction by the Bishop of Birmingham. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920, pp. ix, 220.

*The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1920. By the Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1920, pp. xii, 326.

*The Problem of Reunion*. Discussed Historically in Seven Essays by Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1920, pp. xxii, 235.

*The Ship "Tyre."* A symbol of the fate of Conquerors as prophesied by Isaiah, Ezekiel and John and fulfilled at Nineveh, Babylon and Rome. A study in the commerce of the Bible. By Wilfred H. Schoff, Secretary of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia. Longmans, Green & Co. London, 1920, pp. 157.

*The Call to Unity*. The Bedell Lectures for 1919 delivered at Kenyon College, May 24 and May 25, 1920. By William T. Manning, S.T.D., D.C.L. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920, pp. 162.

*Lambeth and Reunion*. An interpretation of the Mind of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. By Frank Theodore Woods, Bishop of Peterborough (Episcopal Secretary of the Lambeth Conference). Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, Martin Linton Smith, Bishop of Hereford. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, New York: The Macmillan Company. London, 1921, pp. 115.

*National Assembly of the Church of England, Summer and Autumn Sessions*, 1920. Report of Proceedings. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1921, pp. 131.

*Bulletins of the Presiding Bishop and Council of the Protestant Church*. Series of 1921. Published by the Department of Publicity, 281 Fourth avenue, New York City, 1921, pp. 110.